FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 170 *3 September 1985*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Israelyan Summary of Disarmament Meeting AA 1

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

'International Observers Roundtable' Program CC 1

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Gorbachev Interview With TIME Magazine A 1
[PRAVDA 2 Sep]
PRAVDA Notes Weinberger Remarks on USSR Threat A 15
[1 Sep]
Arbatov Leads Delegation to U.S. for Conference A 16
TASS Cites Former CIA Official on KAL Incident A 16
[Lyutyy]
Agriculture Secretary Block Departs 1 Sep A 17
[IZVESTIYA 2 Sep]

NORTHEAST ASIA

Batmonh Speaks at 29 Aug Kremlin Dinner C 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Aug]

SOUTH ASIA

Afghan-Pakistani Talks Session in Geneva Ends D 1
'Large-Scale' Military Offensive in DRA Province D 1
[Paris]

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Vorotnikov-Led Delegation Visits SRV on Anniversary E 1
Delegation Departs [PRAVDA 31 Aug] E 1
Arrival in Hanoi E 1
Reception by SRV Leadership E 1

Lenin Monument Ceremony E 2
Kalin Speaks at Bridge Dedication E 2
Ho Chi Minh Museum Honored E 3
Visit to Xuan Mai Hydroproject E 4
Army Troops Parade E 4
National Day Exhibition E 5

WESTERN EUROPE

Gorbachev Meets French Communist Party Leader G 1
FRG's Woerner Reproached on SDI Support G 1
[Chernyshev]
Finnish Economic Cooperation Projects Surveyed G 2
FRG 'Trutzige Sachsen' Maneuvers Aggressive G 3

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Saudi Official on Talks With Korniyenko H 1
[KUNA]
IZVESTIYA: Supreme Soviet Message to Khamene'i H 1
[30 Aug]

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Chilean Socialist Party Congress Described K 1
CPSU's Vorozheykin Leaves for Uruguay Congress K 1
[PRAVDA 29 Aug]

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

MILITARY DEVELOPMENTS

Marshal Sokolov Issues Order of Day on VJ Day V 1
Sokolov, Zimyanin Attend VJ Day Meeting V 1
AFP: Press Reports Kulikov's Activities V 2

ISRAELYAN SUMMARY OF DISARMAMENT MEETING

LD301531 Moscow TASS in English 1512 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, August 30 TASS -- The summer session of the Disarmament Conference ended in the Geneva Palace of Nations today. Summing up the results of its work, the head of the Soviet delegation Viktor Israelyan said in his speech that while the Soviet Union and socialist countries jointly with nonaligned states have been pursuing persistently the line at achieving concrete results, the United States and its allies had been exerting efforts in the opposite direction. He said that as a result of vigorous actions of the socialist countries the conference started considering this year one of the most topical questions of the present, that of prevention of the arms race in outer space.

The participants in the conference received with much interest the new initiative of the Soviet Union which came out with the proposal to put on the agenda of the 40th session of the United Nations General Assembly the question "On International Cooperation in Peaceful Exploration of Outer Space in the Conditions of its Non-Militarisation." Many delegations pointed to the consistency and persistence of the Soviet Union's efforts on the question of preventing an arms race in space and noted that the implementation of the Soviet programme of "star peace" opens broad prospects for cooperation of states in the peaceful exploration and uses of outer space to the benefit of all countries and peoples of the earth.

The Soviet Union's unilateral moratorium on any nuclear explosions since August 6, 1985, could give a new impetus to the talks in the framework of a conference on comprehensive test ban on nuclear weapons. But the stand of Western countries, above all the United States and the proclaimed intention of the U.S. Administration to continue nuclear tests impeded progress in this matter.

The talks on the ban on chemical weapons were intensified somewhat this year. The progress at the talks could have been even more telling, if it were not for the decision of the U.S. Administration to start the production of binary chemical weapons.

The Soviet representative said that the Soviet Union, true to its Leninist foreign policy, will continue a resolute struggle for the limitation of arms race and for disarmament, using in these purposes also the possibilities of the disarmament conference.

The results of the work of the conference are expressed in its report which will be submitted to a regular session of the United Nations General Assembly. On the proposal of a wide range of states it includes, specifically, the provisions which welcome the Soviet Union's decision to impose a moratorium on any nuclear explosions and expresses the conviction that if the United States should adopt such a decision, too, this would be a very useful step. The report expresses concern over continued U.S. statements that a nuclear test ban is only a "long-term aim" of the USA. The report also expresses much anxiety over information that the USA intends to almost double the volume of its nuclear armaments by the late 80s. The report of the conference also rejects resolutely the doctrines of nuclear deterrence that increases the risk of an outbreak of nuclear war.

'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE' PROGRAM

LD020225 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1130 GMT 1 Sep 85

["International Observers Roundtable" program, with Aleksey Nikolayevich Grigoryev, TASS political observer; Viktor Aleksandrovich Tsoppi, NOVOYE VREMYA observer; and Igor Pavlovich Charikov, All-Union Radio foreign political commentator]

World War II

[Text] [Charikov] Hello, esteemed comrades! Today our calendars show 1 September. In most people's minds this day is associated with the coming of autumn and the start of lessons in school and other educational establishments. There is, however, another calendar on which we mark off political events — joyous and festive ones, as well as tragic and sad ones. The start of September on that calendar is extremely rich in events. First and foremost is World Peace Day. September first was proclaimed the world day of struggle for peace because on that day 46 years ago there began the bloodiest and cruelest war in the history of mankind which cost tens of millions of human lives. World War II taught mankind a number of lessons, and the results of the war substantially changed the political face of our planet as well as the paths of development not only of individual countries and peoples but of whole continents.

The defeat of the most reactionary forces in the world, German facism and Japanese militarism, was at the same time an assertion of the ideas of humanism, the ideas of justice and reason, and acted as a powerful stimulus for the upsurge of the national liberation movements and social and economic reforms.

[Tsoppi] When reactionary Western politicians and political scientists try to interpret the lessons of World War II to the advantage of those imperialist circles that are now thinking about a third and last war, they resort instinctively to invention and falsification. In the year of the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascist Germany and militarist Japan, there are more than enough examples of such ill-intentioned distortions of history. The tactless — to put it mildly -- forgetting of the unparalleled feat of the Soviet people blends in harmoniously, in particular, with the genuflections to the Hitlerites, with the rehabilitation of Nazism in general and, currently, of Japanese militarism in particular. A furious attack on the agreements signed in Yalta and Potsdam, aimed at breaking up the postwar order in Europe, is being synchronized with a brazen interference in the internal affairs of the socialist countries, including the socialist countries in Asia that acquired independence as a result of the defeat of Japan. This is because the policies of the socialist countries and the very fact of their existence and forward development make the global revanche by imperialism for the crushing defeat of its strike detachments in Europe and Asia in World War II impossible.

Today is the right time to recall that the finale of World War II was not at all the barbarous bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki by the United States, even though the top officials in the U.S. Administration say today that those bombings were a salvation and that they brought the end of the war considerably closer. In fact, one American journalist, in a report from Hiroshima on the day of the 40th anniversary of the bombing, had the temerity to say that the Japanese were grateful to the United States for that monstrous crime. After all, militarist Japan, which as early as 1936 had concluded a pact with Hitler's Germany spearheaded against the USSR and legitimizing Japan's imperialist claims to the whole of Asia, did not capitulate after the monstrous, and really completely unjustified crime committed by U.S. imperialism against the Japanese people. It was brought to its knees -- and this should be remembered -- only after the Soviet Army, carrying out one of the most brilliant lightning operations in military history, completely routed the Japanese Kwangtung army in Manchuria. And this was done in full accord with the agreements reached between the Soviet Union, Britain, and France at the Yalta and Potsdam conferences. Yes, unlike our then allies, we did not become like a cunning monkey sitting on top of a hill watching the fight between two tigers in the valley. Contrary to their pledges, the United States and Britain opened the second front in Europe only after it had become clear to all that the crushing of Hitlerism under the strikes by the Soviet Army was inevitable. Our second front in the East did not keep people waiting. If it were not for our second front, the signing of Japan's capitulation on board the U.S. battleship Missouri on 2 September 1945 might not have happened, for the leaders and military chiefs of the United States and Britain were calculating on conquering the Japanese war machine in 1946, or maybe even in 1948. And so, the participation of the Soviet Union in the final stage of World War II in the Far East was of colossal historical importance for, among others, all the peoples of that region.

Vietnamese National Day

Today we are marking both the end of World War II and the start of an independent, free life for the heroic Vietnamese people. It was on 2 September that the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, as it was then called, was proclaimed. This became possible as a result of the August revolution in the same year accompanied under the leadership of the Vietnamese communists led by that remarkable man, Ho Chi Minh. We know a lot about Vietnam -- our country is on truly friendly terms with the Vietnamese people -- so I shall not speak today about the great successes that the country has achieved or the importance, the great importance, that it has acquired in the world and in Asia.

I should simply like to recall, if you will permit, that I arrived in Vietnam soon after the Vietnamese finally began to live a free life and a life without war. It was when, after having endured a very arduous war and having won the war against the French colonizers, Vietnam in 1954, North Vietnam, gained independence. The country was divided, as you will remember, as a result of the Geneva agreements. I was an interpreter at that time with a Gosplan delegation that came to help the Vietnamese comrades draw up their first 3-year economic development plan. Taking a direct part in the preparation of that plan and the drawing up of its most important points was Comrade Ho Chi Minh, whom our delegation saw very often. And even then, the Vietnamese, thinking of their economic development and that the time had finally come to stand on their own two feet, kept saying: We need to unify the country -- Vietnam must be united. At that time this was the leit-motiv of the whole of the life of the Vietnamese. Well, as you know, this was not to take place for some time. The Vietnamese had to live through an even more terrible war, when they were subjected to aggression from the United States. The country experienced everything: It experienced terrifying bombing, poisons...

[Charikov, interrupting] Napalm.

[Tsoppi] Napalm. Many people were killed, but this small people turned out to be unbroken. It inflicted the heaviest defeat on the greatest imperialist country and, for this great imperialist country, the Vietnam syndrome has still not been overcome. Today, when the United States carries out aggressive actions in other countries, against other people, it constantly hears from people: You are repeating, you are close to repeating the disgraceful and bloody Vietnamese experience. Of course, it is very good that we today have excellent all-round friendly, very productive relations; that Vietnam, together with Cambodia and Laos today, play an increasingly important role in this region of the world. Recently a conference of, again, the three ministers of foreign affairs of these countries took place and they came out with new, constructive proposals directed at stabilizing and normalizing the situation in the whole of Southeast Asia.

Asian Security

[Charikov] The Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community consistently come out in favor of consolidating peace, of strengthening the security of the Asian Continent. Recent examples are the Soviet-Lao communique and the speech by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev at the dinner in the Kremlin last Thursday [29 August] in honor of the delegation of our Mongolian comrades. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev again stressed that the Soviet Government's decision to stop all nuclear tests unilaterally from 6 August this year corresponds to the vital interests of the security of all the world's peoples. This decision has particular significance for the Asian-Pacific region, for it is precisely here that both American atomic bombs were dropped. It is now especially relevant, said Mikhail Sergeyevich, to stress the need to struggle against the intrigues of imperialism and reaction in Asia. It is relevant because the peoples of the Asian-Pacific region, together with all progressive mankind, are celebrating the 40th anniversary of victory over Japanese militarism. The Soviet Union, consistently treading the path of peace, recently put forward a proposal to develop a common, integrated approach to the problems of security in Asia. The essence of this approach consists of uniting the efforts of all Asian states, regardless of their social system, in the name of securing peace and stability. There are, of course, many difficulties to overcome to achieve this goal, and we are aware of this. However, more important than the contradictions between the states of the region, more important than the differences in their approaches to existing problems, is something else: the peoples of Asia are connected by a community of vital interests which address, in many respects, matters under dispute, those disputes that have been generated in the past and others that stand in their path in the future. This community, as Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev said, dictates the need for cooperation and good-neighborliness on the basis of a wide conception of security -- a conception that could incorporate the five principles of peaceful coexistence, which have already been worked out in their own time; the ten principles of Bandung; and a number of initiatives by the Soviet Union, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, the countries of Indochina that you were talking about, Viktor Aleksandrovich, India, and other states of the region, for making the Indian Ocean a zone of peace. To a significant extent the strengthening of security in Asia would be promoted by a total stoppage of nuclear weapons testing by the nuclear powers, including on the Asian Continent and in the Pacific and Indian Ocean basins, and by a refusal of states in the region to take part in the plans for space militarization. It is not easy to achieve these aims; to implement the concept of Asian security, as, by the way, the security of other continents, is a task of long duration. As far as the Soviet Union and the countries of the socialist community are concerned, they have on more than one occasion shown both readiness and political will for the solution of any tasks.

FRG Antiwar Demonstration

[Grigoryev] I would like to return again to our political calendar, or rather to its page on which is written 1 September, and, further, international day of peace. Today, in many countries of the most diverse type, antiwar demonstrations, meetings, and so on are taking place. But I would like to say something about a meeting that will be held in a country that I know quite well, and where I worked for over 6 years. I am speaking of the FRG, and more exactly of the small town of Stukenbrock.

Every year, for many years, on 1 September an antiwar demonstration attended by many thousands is held here. Why precisely in Stukenbrock? It is a small undistinguished town. It is not even a town, but half-way to being a village, in the northern part of the West German land Nordrhein-Westfalen. Every year thousands and thousands of the most diverse people gather here. Primarily these are West Germans, but many delegations come from the most diverse countries -- Poland, France, Italy, and Yugoslavia, as well as from our country -- a delegation of the Soviet Committee of [War] Veterans always goes there. Why do they go there in particular?

When you enter this little town and approach its memorial, you immediately see a mass of tombstones on which first names have been inscribed in Russian. Only first names; there are no surnames -- Ivan, Nikolay, Petr, Mariya. I remember one stone there, the inscription of which immediately, so to speak, strikes you in the heart. It is written as follows, again in Russian: Here lies buried my happiness, my beloved husband Nikolay Timofeyevich. And this memorial, it had to witness much even after the war. Neo-Nazis tried to blow it up; the authorities of this land, consisting of Christian Democrats, somehow tried to take it away quietly. But West German antifascists took the monument under their protection, both those who had themselves gone through the concentration camps and those who had been born during the war. They created an organization called Flowers for Stukenbrock. The most diverse people joined this organization: workers and priests, young and elderly people, Social Democrats and communists, and members of the Greens Party which arose later. This organization carried out enormous work. It told people, FRG citizens, about what Stukenbrock was, that these are the ashes that should strike the hearts and call people to struggle against a repetition of the terrible war.

If you listen to the rhetoric of the right-wing deputies of the Bundestag who repeat for many hours that only under the U.S. missile umbrella, only thanks to Reagan's space weapons, can the West German burgher sleep peacefully; if you leaf through the press, which writes endlessly about how the Russians are preparing a new war, how Russian tanks can be on the Rhine within 48 hours, and so on and so on, then you can only shout: Come to your senses! Surely you have not forgotten everything that this war brought? But they do not hear. They do not hear, but others hear. Those who today, again, on 1 September, in Stukenbrock and in many towns of West Germany, the FRG, will go to antiwar meetings and demonstrations and say: There must never be war again; the German land must never again become the place from which war comes to the world. They hear. When you see and listen to these people, those who create living chains many kilometers long as was the case during the struggle against the siting of American nuclear missiles in Mutlangen; when you see and listen to people who come to the antiwar meeting in Stukenbrock, then you understand that, no, they have not forgotten. They have not forgotten and they are carrying on a struggle. You always want to shake these people by the hand and say to them: Thank you.

In the German language there are two words for the word monument: Denkmal and Mahnmal. The second word means a monument calling for something not to be repeated again. So this Mahnmal is a monument that calls for no repetition of the terrible war. This applies not only to the memorial in Stukenbrock, which has been created and is maintained by the organization Flowers for Stukenbrock, but it also applies in general, in my opinion, to the antiwar movement in the FRG, in France, and in Western Europe, generally throughout Europe -- the antiwar movement that today, on a day that is memorable, a black memory, for everyone. It seems to me, this word Mahnmal rings with particular force.

[Tsoppi] As an appeal.

[Grigoryev] As an appeal.

Dublin Committee

[Charikov] Now, Aleksey Nikolayevich, you said that the antiwar movement has spread very widely today, onto the streets and squares of European towns. I want to say that this is also because at the same time, the international day of trade union action for peace and disarmament is taking place. This means that trade unions, that is, the organized part of the working people primarily of the working class, has come out onto the streets with antiwar slogans. This is quite a new phenomenon, for until recently the trade unions in the countries of Western Europe, to a lesser extent in Western Europe, but also in the United States, stood aside from political struggle, limiting themselves to purely economic slogans.

But now, ever more frequently at demonstrations and meetings, we see such demands as, for example, to stop the Arms Race, among the demands of trade unions. Several years ago an International Trade Union Committee for Peace and Disarmament was created with a membership of representatives from trade union associations in socialist countries and a number of capitalist states. The committee was called the Dublin Committee, for its birth, if one can call it that, happened in Dublin, the capital of Ireland. The Dublin Committee took on a difficult but at the same time exceptionally timely, important task: coordinating antiwar demonstrations in separate countries and directing them under common slogans.

It is typical that the activity of the Dublin Committee immediately aroused a sharply negative reaction from militaristic circles in Washington and in other NATO member-countries. In 1983 the regular session of the committee was supposed to take place in the United States, in New York, on the invitation of American trade unions who are members of the committee. The U.S. authorities, however, refused to give entry visas to a number of session participants and, in this way, they effectively wrecked it. But in doing this they admitted, they demonstrated, that the Dublin Committee is a serious political organization, a serious political force which they generally fear. In the end, the siting of the committee was transferred from New York to Vienna, where I was able to get to know its work closely, because in those days I was there as a TV and radio correspondent.

At the end of April of this year, the Dublin Committee held its session here in Moscow. A final document called "Forty Years of War [as heard] -- Lessons From the Past in the Name of the Future," was passed at the meeting. This short but very weighty document talks about the dreadful threat over mankind -- the threat of nuclear war. It says that it is essential that this threat be removed by means of mass demonstrations by all organized working people to defend peace and security.

[Grigoryev] Well, our conversation has just been about the participation of trade unions in the antiwar movement. It just so happens that on Monday the 2d, together with a group of colleagues, I will be flying to the FRG, where near Frankfurt we will have a traditional seminar with our colleagues, representatives of the FRG trade union of workers in the printing and paper industries, of which, by the way, their union of journalists is a part, on the role of the press in the modern world; on the role of the press in covering the 40th anniversary of the victory over fascism; the press in both countries; on the coverage by the press and mass media in both countries of the antiwar movement, etc. Well, such seminars, I repeat, are already traditional. Of course they are not only of benefit to their participants, but they also show that the trade union movement is ever more actively and closely moving toward becoming a part of the antiwar movement, not an observer from the sidelines, because in the final analysis we are talking about all our lives.

U.S. Labor Day

[Charikov] Continuing the theme of the participation of organized working people in the political struggle, I want to remind our listeners that tomorrow the so-called Labor Day is celebrated in the United States. It is celebrated officially with a multitude of national flags and festive events. In recent years President Reagan has made a radio speech on this national holiday. Labor Day, which has been a national holiday in the United States since its legal enactment in 1894, was for a long time the classless counterbalance of the proletarian 1 May which, by the way, was also born in the United States, in Chicago. The authorities as well as big private entrepreneurs had an interest in emasculating Labor Day, removing even the symbolic remains of its class content, turning it, as a nonworking Monday, into a kind of long weekend.

But Labor Day in the United States, as indeed the whole trade union movement, has changed its face significantly in recent years. Labor Day now serves as a kind of signal for the beginning of the strike season in America. At this time, as a rule, negotiations over new labor agreements between trade unions and employers begin. These negotiations are, as a rule, not easy, and are accompanied by strikes. The American trade union press has observed in recent years that it is becoming increasingly difficult to conclude new agreements with owners. Their conditions get tougher every year, as a rule. Employers do not wish to make concessions and they insist on having things their own way, and what is more they receive the full support of the federal authorities, who, by the way, have no right at all to interfere in labor disputes if they take place at only private firms. The authorities, however, continue to interfere, as was the case, for instance, 4 years ago during the strike by the air traffic controllers' union. The Reagan administration took an unprecedented step then: It decided to break up the trade union. The trade union was banned and its leaders and activists were arrested and handed over to the courts. One has to say that, in general, throughout recent years -- I mean here all the time that the Reagan administration has been in power -- constant pressure has been applied on American trade unions, and punitive measures have rained down on them.

A large number of examples could be cited. The latest one is the strike of 8,500 steel workers at plants belonging to Wheeling-Pittsburg. Trade union activists are hounded by thugs from ultrarightist organizations and overtly by CIA agents. The purpose of the campaign is to weaken the trade unions, and if possible to deprive them of leadership, to compromise their leaders, to disorient the trade union movement, and to divert it away not just from political issues but also social and economic issues, which grow in acuteness in the United States with every passing year. Thus, through the efforts of the Reagan administration, the number of trade union members has gone down in America. There were 20.1 million; now there are a little over 17 million. As I have already said, this is being done by means of intimidating working people, by closing enterprises, moving them abroad, and so on. The 1935 law on the right to join a trade union is very frequently boycotted by the owners of enterprises, and in individual states antitrade union legislation exists to this day.

In Tennessee, for instance, under such legislation the owners of enterprises are able to pay their workforce only one-half or one-third of wages earned by workers at enterprises where there is a trade union. The gigantic J.C. Penney textile concern, whose factories are scattered around the country, predominantly in southern states, categorically prohibits all activities by trade unions on the territory of its empire. But in these circumstances, actions in conformity with the laws arouse opposition. Despite the reduction in trade union numbers, the unions are becoming more and more militant and united, acting more robustly and demonstrating solidarity with other trade unions on strike. Even the present conservative leadership of the AFL-CIO trade union federation is incapable of restraining Americans' growing dissatisfaction with the administration's domestic and foreign policy, its immoderate military spending, and adventurism on the world scene.

South Africa

[Tsoppi] When we say that increasingly broad circles of the population in different countries are actively and interestedly drawn into the campaign for peace, not just the campaign for peace, but also the struggle for freedom, the struggle for human dignity, and the struggle for democracy, we cannot fail to note the phenomenon that among the participants in this struggle is an increasing number of believers and even their pastors, their ministers. This applies to Africa, among other places. In the Republic of South Africa [RSA], in particular, priests of different denominations -- Catholics, Protestants, and others -- are increasingly active in protesting against the system of apartheid and in advocating the right to life, the right to work, and the right to freedom for the country's indigenous population at long last, so that it can at last take possession of its own country. But another phenomenon, an opposite phenomenon, can also be observed: Within the heart of those church circles which have always professed and preached submission and the equality of rich and poor, and who have always rejected the class struggle, and reject it even more robustly today, attempts are being made to, so to speak, call the ardor of believers who today are more and more consciously embarking on the path of struggle.

In West Germany, where such a mighty and widespread peace movement is now developing, a congress took place in the little town of Koenigstein of the very reactionary Catholic organization called Church in Distress. What was discussed at the congress? The congress discussed anything and everything, except those people who, as believers, suffer in the struggle for their rights. It was of course stated that all the threats to human rights derive from the East. Anything and everything was discussed, but nothing was said about what is happening -- indeed, what was happening at exactly the same time as these people were meeting in Koenigstein -- in South Africa. The explanation for all this is very simple. I recently came across a report of the Polish paper RZECZPOSPOLITA which said that in June of this year the Vatican Bank provided Pretoria, that selfsame regime of apartheid, with $114 million American dollars, of course.

The Soviet Government statement on the situation in the RSA published on Saturday reflects very precisely the sentiments not only of the Soviet people, but also those of the broadest circles of world public opinion. The statement says quite justly that the new crimes of the racist South African authorities, which are launching the most brutal repressions against the African population, are arousing our anger and indignation. As for the U.S. position, all the hypocrisy of that government, which attempts to pass itself off as a defender of human rights and democracy, emerges quite graphically. The U.S. President's statement that segregation has been eliminated in the RSA and that it is all now just a question of the desirability of refining democracy in that country is an open mockery of the tragic plight of the African majority.

[Charikov] Well, esteemed comrades, our airtime is at an end. On behalf of the participants of the program, I thank you for your attention and bid you farewell. Goodbye, and all the best.

GORBACHEV INTERVIEW WITH TIME MAGAZINE

PM020927 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Sep 85 First Edition pp 1, 2

["M.S. Gorbachev's Replies to America's TIME Magazine"]

[Text] America's TIME magazine has asked General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee Mikhail Gorbachev to reply to a number of questions and also to receive for a conversation the editor-in-chief of Time, Inc, Henry Grunwald, the managing editor of TIME magazine Ray Cave, the assistant managing editor Richard Duncan, and the magazine's Moscow bureau chief James Jackson. The conversation took place on 28 August of this year.

We publish below M.S. Gorbachev's replies and his conversation with the American journalists:

Question: How would you characterize U.S.-Soviet relations at this juncture and what are the primary events that define that relationship?

Answer Had you asked me this question some 2 months ago, I would have said that the situation in our relations was becoming somewhat better and that some hopes of positive shifts were appearing.

To my deep regret, I could not say that today.

The truth should be faced squarely. Despite the negotiations which have begun in Geneva and the agreement to hold a summit meeting, the relations between our two countries continue to deteriorate, the arms race is intensifying, and the war threat is not subsiding. What is the matter, why is all this happening? My colleagues and I are quite exacting and self-critical when it comes to our own activities not only in this country but outside it, and we are asking ourselves again and again if that is somehow connected with our actions.

But what is there that we can reproach ourselves with in this context? Indeed, in this crucial [otvetsvtennyy] situation Moscow is trying to practice restraint in its pronouncements with regard to the United States. It is not resorting to anti-American campaigns, nor is it fomenting hatred for your country. We believe it very important that even in times of political aggravation the feeling of traditional respect harbored by Soviet people for the American people should not be injured, and, as far as I can judge, that feeling is largely a mutual one.

And is it bad that, at a time when the disarmament negotiations have resumed and preparations are under way for the first summit in 6 years, we are persistently seeking ways to break the vicious circle and bring the process of arms limitation out of the dead end? In particular, that is precisely the objective of our moratorium on nuclear explosions and of our proposal to the United States to join it and to resume the negotiations on a complete ban on nuclear tests as well as of the proposals regarding peaceful cooperation and the prevention of an arms race in space. We are convinced that we should look for a way out of the current difficult situation together.

It is hard, therefore, to understand why our proposals have provoked such outspoken dspleasure on the part of responsible U.S. statesmen. Attempts are known to have been made to portray them as nothing but pure propaganda.

Anyone even slightly familiar with the essence of the matters would easily see that behind our proposals there are very serious intentions and not just an attempt to influence public opinion.

All real efforts to limit nuclear weapons began with a ban on tests -- just recall the 1963 treaty which was a first major step in that direction. A complete end to nuclear tests would halt the nuclear arms race in the most dangerous area, that of qualitative improvement. And it would, besides, seriously contribute to maintaining and strengthening the regime of nonproliferation of nuclear weapons.

If all that we are doing is, indeed, viewed as mere propaganda, why not respond to it according to the principle of "an eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth"? We have stopped nuclear explosions. Then you, Americans, could up and take revenge by doing likewise. You could, to boot, deal us yet another propaganda blow, say, by suspending the development of one of your new strategic missiles. And we would respond with the same kind of "propaganda." And so on and so forth. Would anyone be harmed by competition in such "propaganda"? Of course, it could not be a substitute for a comprehensive arms limitation agreement but it would, no doubt, be a significant step leading to such an agreement.

The U.S. Administration has regrettably taken a different road. In response to our moratorium it defiantly hastened to set off yet another nuclear explosion as if to spite everyone. And to our proposals concerning a peaceful space it responded with a decision to conduct a first operational test of an anti-satellite weapon. As if that were not enough, it has also launched another "campaign of hatred" against the USSR.

What kind of impression does all this make? On the one hand, that of some kind of confusion and uncertainty in Washington. The only way I can explain this is anxiety lest our initiatives should wreck the version of the Soviet Union being the "focus of evil" and the source of universal danger which, in fact, underlies the entire arms race policy. On the other hand, there is an impression of a shortage of responsibility for the destinies of the world. And this, frankly speaking, gives rise again and again to the question whether it is at all possible in such an atmosphere to conduct business in a normal way and to build rational relations between countries.

You asked me what is the primary thing that defines Soviet-American relations. I think it is the immutable fact that whether we like one another or not, we can either survive or perish only together. The principal question which we must answer is whether we are at last ready to recognize that there is no other way but to live at peace with each other and whether we are prepared to switch our mentality and our mode of acting from a warlike to a peaceful track. As you say, live and let live. We call it peaceful coexistence. As for the Soviet Union, we answer that question in the affirmative.

Question: What do you think will be the results of your Geneva meeting with President R. Reagan in November? What specific actions should the U.S. and the Soviet Union take to improve their bilateral relations?

Answer: In fact, I have already set forth the reasons why today I look at the prospects of the Geneva meeting with more caution than I did at the time we gave our agreement to that meeting. Its outcome, after all, will depend to a great extent upon what is taking place now.

Everyone would probably agree that the political atmosphere for talks takes shape well in advance. Neither the President nor I will be able to ignore the mood in our respective countries or that of our allies. In other words, actions today largely determine the "scenario" for our November discussions.

I will not hide from you my disappointment and concern about what is happening now.

We cannot but be troubled by the approach which, as I see it, has begun to emerge in Washington from both its practical policy and the statements made by responsible White House staffers. That is a scenario of pressure, of attempts to drive us into a corner, to ascribe to us, as so many times in the past, every mortal sin -- from unleashing an arms race to "aggression" in the Middle East, from violations of human rights to some scheming or other even in South Africa. This is not a state policy, it is a feverish search for "forces of evil."

We are prepared to have a meaningful and businesslike talk; we can also present claims. I wish to assure the readers of this magazine that we have something to say about the United States being responsible for the nuclear arms race, and about its conduct in various regions of the world, about support to those who in effect engage in terrorism, and about violations of human rights in America itself, as well as in many countries close to it. But here is what I am thinking about: Is it worthwhile for the sake of that to set up a summit meeting with which our nations and people on all continents associate their hopes for peace, and for a secure and tranquil life? Abusive words are no help in a good cause.

I see the concept of such an important meeting differently. We in Moscow, naturally, are well aware of how profound is all that divides us. Look at what U.S. political leaders have been saying in recent years. We could not disregard statements with which we do not agree and which, frankly speaking, in many cases we are indignant about. At the same time we have not lost hope that, after all, points of contact, areas of common or parallel interests can be found. Indeed, there are reasons for this. Take, for example, the statements to the effect that nuclear war must not be waged and that it cannot be won, or that the United States is not seeking military superiority. In other words, I have been reckoning on having an honest and unbiased conversation imbued with a desire to find a way leading back from the edge of the nuclear precipice; to discuss not myths and stereotypes of which we have had enough, but the real problems, the real interests of our countries, our future and the future of the entire world community.

But there is every indication that the other side is now preparing for something quite different. It looks as if the stage is being set for a bout between some kind of political "supergladiators" with just one thought in mind: how best to deal a deft blow at the opponent and score an extra point in this "bout". What is striking about this are both the forms and the content of some statements. The recent "lecture" of Mr. McFarlane is a case in point. It contains not only the full "set of accusations" we are going to be charged with in Geneva but also what I would call a very specific interpretation of the upcoming negotiations. It appears that even the slightest headway depends exclusively upon concessions by the Soviet Union -- concessions on all questions: on armaments, on regional problems, and even on our domestic affairs.

If all this is meant seriously, then it is evident that Washington is not preparing for the event we have agreed upon. The summit meeting is designed for negotiations, for negotiations on the basis of equality and not for signing an act of someone's capitulation. This is all the more true since we have not lost a war to the United States, or even a battle, and we owe it absolutely nothing. Nor, for that matter, does the United States owe us.

But if they are not meant seriously, then the bellicose outcries are all the more inappropriate. Why flex muscles needlessly, why stage noisy shows and transfer the methods of domestic political struggles to the relations between two nuclear powers? In them the language of strength is useless and dangerous. There is still time before the summit meeting; quite a lot can be done for it to be constructive and useful. But this, as you well understand, depends on both sides.

Question: What is your view of the Strategic Defense Initiative research program in the context of U.S.-Soviet relations? Can you envisage a mutual agreement prohibiting the development of such systems? And what kinds of verification would the Soviet Union agree to in such a case? If an agreement cannot be reached, what do you foresee in other aspects of arms control?

Answer: Responding to critics of the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative, official Washington likes to advance an argument it believes to be a clincher -- it is after all the Russians that oppose "star wars". If this is so, then it has to be a good and proper program. But if this logic is followed in the nuclear age, a rather gloomy future awaits us.

Our approach, and I hope that of many Americans, to this question is different. There are, we believe, situations in which both sides are losers. They are nuclear war, the arms race, and international tensions. And, accordingly, there are situations in which they are both winners. Those are peace and cooperation, equal security, and elimination of fear of a nuclear catastrophe.

As to the evaluation of the "star wars" program, we cannot take in earnest the assertions that the SDI would allegedly guarantee invulnerability from nuclear attack weapons thus leading to the elimination of nuclear weapons. In the opinion of our experts (and, to my knowledge, of many of yours) this is sheer fantasy and a pipe dream. However, even on a much more modest scale at which the Strategic Defense Initiative, according to experts, can be implemented as an anti-missile defense system limited in its capabilities, the SDI is very dangerous. This project will, no doubt, whip up the arms race in all areas, which means that the threat of war will increase. That is why this project is bad for us and for you and for anybody in general.

We approach what is called the SDI research program from the same point of view. First of all, we do not consider it to be a research program. In our view, it is the first stage of the project to develop a new ABM system prohibited under the relevant treaty of 1972. Just think of the scale of it alone — 70 billion dollars to be earmarked for the next few years. That is an incredible amount for pure research as emphasized even by U.S. scientists as well. The point is that in today's prices those appropriations are more than four times the cost of the Manhattan Project (the program for development of nuclear weapons) and more than double the cost of the Apollo program which provided for the development of space research for a whole decade -- up to the landing of man on the moon. That this is far from being a pure research program is also confirmed by other facts, including tests scheduled for space strike weapons systems.

That is why the entire SDI program and its so-called research component are a new and even more dangerous round of the arms race which will inevitably lead to a further aggravation of Soviet-American relations. To preclude this it is necessary, as was agreed in January by the minister for foreign affairs of the USSR and the U.S. secretary of state, to prevent an arms race in space. We are confident that such an agreement is possible and verifiable. (I have to point out that we trust the Americans no more than they trust us and that is why we are interested in reliable verification of any agreement as much as they are.

Without such an agreement it will not be possible to reach an agreement on the limitation and reduction of nuclear weapons either. The interrelationship between defensive and offensive arms is so obvious as to require no proof. Thus, if the present U.S. position on space weapons is its last word, the Geneva negotiations, and one has to be forthright about it, will lose all sense.

Question: Since the time you became general secretary you have taken several steps to improve the Soviet economy. Could you not tell us about the further steps you propose to take? What in your view are the main problems of the Soviet economy? What changes in the world economy could be beneficial to the Soviet Union?

Answer: Let me start with history. There are problems whose origin was beyond our control. The old regime left the Soviet Government with a grim legacy: A backward economy, strong vestiges of feudalism, millions of illiterate people.

Add to this two devastating wars which ravaged a major part of our country, leaving in ashes and ruin much of what the work of the people had created. There were irreparable losses: twenty million perished during the years of the Patriotic War, with millions wounded and maimed. Forty years have passed but our people still preserve the sorrowful memories of the past, and of the bereavement they suffered. To heal the wounds inflicted upon human hearts and upon the land, the Soviet people needed peace and nothing but peace.

It was often asserted in the West that it would take the USSR some 50 to 100 years to restore all that had been destroyed as a result of the facist invasion. Having restored their national economy in the shortest possible time, the Soviet people did what would have seemed the impossible. But the fact remains that after the revolution we were forced to spend almost 2 decades, if not more, on wars and reconstruction.

Under those arduous conditions, using our system's potential, we have succeeded in making the Soviet Union a major economic world power. This as attested to the strength and the immense capabilities of socialism.

There are also difficulties of a different nature due to our own shortcomings and deficiencies. We make no secret of this. Sometimes we do not work well enough. We have not yet learned proper managerial skills as is required by a modern economy and warranted by our enormous capabilities, i.e. raw materials and skilled manpower resources, advanced science (especially fundamental science), the support and, as we can now see, the readiness and willingness of people to work better, to improve quality and efficiency.

The imperative of our time is to decisively improve the state of things. Hence the concept of accelerated social and eocnomic development. Today it is our most important, top-priority task. Ways to accomplish the task have been determined following comprehensive discussion. We are planning to make better use of capital investments, to give prioirty to the development of such major industries as engineering, electrical engineering and electronics, energy production, transport and others. Attention remains focused also on the agro-industrial complex, especially as regards processing and storage of agricultural produce. In short, we will do all that is necessary to better meet demand in high quality food products.

To improve the functioning of the national economy it will be necessary to further strengthen centralization in strategic areas of the economy through making individual branches, regions and elements of the economy more responsive to the needs of economic development. But at the same time we are seeking to strengthen democractic principles in management, to broaden the autonomy of production associations, enterprises, collective and state farms, to develop local economic self-management, and to encourage initiative and a spirit of enterprise, naturally in the interests of society and not to its detriment.

In short, we seek the most rational methods of managing the economy. Large-scale economic experiments are under way, which are aimed essentially at developing a more efficient mechanism of management that would dramatically accelerate the rate of scientific and technological progress, and make better use of all resources. Our objective is that, in solving this task, all levels of material and moral incentives and such tools as profit, pricing, credit, and cost-accounting of enterprises should be put to work. That is the thrust of our work for radical improvement in the entire system of management and planning.

In addition, we are bringing into play other potentials for speeding up economic development. I mean greater discipline and order, demanding more from everyone, from worker to minister, a drive against irresponsibility and red tape, instilling labor ethics, ensuring greater social justice throughout our society.

So we have enough economic problems and things to attend to, and indeed what country has not? We are aware of our problems and we are confident of the capabilities inherent in our social system and our country. I have recently visited various regions, had meetings with many people -- workers and farmers, engineers and scientists. And what was common to all those meetings? The need for a drastic change, the necessity to radically improve performance are not only supported by the people, but becoming their demands, the real imperative of our time.

I want to emphasize this: The attention we have recently been devoting to the economy is due not to an intention to set new records in producing metals, oil, cement, machine tools, or other products. The main thing is to make life better for people. There is no goal more important to us. This year alone the decision was made to raise the salaries of several categories of employees in public health and science and of engineers and technicians, to improve the material status of a considerable number of retired people, to allocate annually free of charge about one million plots of land for planting orchards, for people to have what you call a "second home". We are planning many other steps as well. Their scope will naturally depend on progress in the economy. Of late, positive changes have become evident: The rates of industrial production and labor productivity have increased.

You ask what changes in the world economy could be of benefit to the Soviet Union. First of all, although this belongs more to politics than economics, and end to the arms race. We would prefer to use every ruble that goes for defense today to meet civilian, peaceful needs instead. As I understand it, you in the United States could also make better use of the money consumed nowadays by arms production. This is not to speak of the problems generated by the budget deficit and public debt. The problems of other countries should also be taken into account. While insisting on cessation of the arms race, we also believe it immoral to waste hundreds of billions on developing means of annihilation while hundreds of millions of people go hungry and are deprived of the elementary essentials. We, all of us, just have no right to ignore this situation.

As to the world economy, we are of the opinion that the Soviet Union, and other countries, too, I believe, would benefit from a more stable general economic, monetary, and financial situation, from an equitable solution to the problem of indebtedness, from progress towards a new economic order. And, of course, the removal of discriminatory restrictions, of all other obstacles to development of world trade, and further development of the international division of labor in which we and our friends and allies intend to play a more active role. All nations of our planet would stand to gain from such changes. By way of example, the establishment of broad trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States would help create hundreds of thousands of additional jobs in your country.

Question: The Soviet Union is anxious to gain better access to advanced technology developed in the United States. How badly is this needed by the Soviet Union, and primarily for what purpose? If the United States does not provide greater access, where do you intend to turn to obtain this technology?

Answer: The very way you are framing the question gives food for thought. Indeed, is there anyone who is not anxious nowadays to gain access to advanced technology? Everyone is, including the U.S. -- even primarily the U.S. I do not mean just the legal purchase of licenses and science-intensive goods or illegal industrial espionage. The U.S. practices its own specific methods as well. The "brain drain", for example, not only from Western Europe but from the developing countries as well. Or take the activities of transnational corporations, which through their subsidiaries are laying their hands on scientific and technological achievements of other countries. Now they are trying to use the so-called "star wars" research program for the same purpose.

As for the Soviet Union, it uses the achievements of foreign science and technology in a much more modest way; though we have never concealed our desire to participate on a broader scale in the international division of labor and to develop scientific and technological co-operation -- all the more so since we are going to this "market" not as supplicants, not empty-handed.

Those selling the idea of the USSR allegedly being consumed with a thirst for U.S. technology forget who they are dealing with and what the Soviet Union is today. Having won technological independence after the revolution, it has long been enjoying the status of a great scientific and technological power. This enabled us to make it through World War II, to be the first to blaze the trail in space and to undertake space research on a large scale, to acquire a reliable defense potential, and on the whole, to successfully develop the country's productive forces. Incidentally, how are we to understand the following inconsistency in the U.S. reasoning? To substantiate increased military spending, all they do in the U.S. is talk about the fantastic achievements of the USSR in the field of technology. When, on the other hand, they need an excuse for prohibitive measures, they portray us as a backward country of yokels with which to trade and, moreover, to cooperate would mean undermining one's own "national security." So where is the truth? What is one to believe?

We speak openly about our dissatisfaction with the scientific and technological level of this or that type of products. Yet we are counting on accelerating scientific and technological progress not through "technological transfusions" from the U.S. to the USSR, but through "transfusions" of the most advanced ideas, discoveries and innovations from Soviet science to Soviet industry and agriculture, through more effective use of our own scientific and technological potential. That is the thrust of our plans and programs. At the same time, we would, naturally, not like to forego those additional advantages which are provided by reciprocal scientific and technolotical cooperation with other countries including the United States.

The seventies saw a fairly broad development of such cooperation in the energy field, including nuclear power in chemistry, space research, cardiology, oncology, and other fields. The benefit was mutual and U.S. scientists are well aware of it. This cooperation has by now come to naught. We regret it, but let me assure you that we will survive because we have first-class science of our own, and because the United States is far from having a monopoly on scientific and technological achievements.

By the way, the U.S., being aware of this, is trying to apply growing pressure on its allies so that they, too, should not trade with us in science-intensive products.

What is more, the United States, under the very same "national security" pretext, places a ban on deliveries of some types of such products to Western Europe and ever more frequently denies access to U.S. laboratories and scientific symposia to representatives of Western Europe.

This is, of course, intended to cause damage to us. But it is not the only objective. The bogey of a "Soviet threat" is also used more and more broadly by the United States in its competitive struggle with its allies to slow down their scientific and technological progress and thus to undermine their competitive positions in the world market. Those designs are becoming increasingly clear. But I do not think that others will put up with the status of nonequal partners who would serve as a source of technology while being restricted to a subsistence diet themselves. Overall, this is a short-sighted and futile practice.

Yet, I would not wish to end our interview on a negative note. It is quite obvious that should two such countries as the United States and the USSR, with their immense scientific and technological potentials, continue to cooperate in this area on an equitable basis, this would benefit the whole world, in addition to our two peoples.

I should like to take this opportunity to convey to the readers of your magazine wishes of good endeavor, happiness, and a peaceful future. On behalf of the Soviet leadership and the Soviet people, I would like once again to tell all Americans the most important thing they must know: War will not come from the Soviet Union, we will never start war.

xxx

Mikhail Gorbachev: I would like to express some views which, I believe, are of great importance for a correct understanding of the problems dealt with in this text. I must say that lately I have received quite a few requests for statements and interviews from the mass media of various countries. Why was the decision taken to respond affirmatively to TIME magazine's request?

When I read your questions I thought that the very wording of these questions contained an expression of a certain concern in connection with the nature of relations that are now taking shape between our two countries. It is not often that we hear from representatives of American political and other circles an expression of alarm on this score. I thought that this nature of the questions that were presented to me (if I understood it correctly) was a very important element.

Then there is yet another reason, a no less important one. It is connected with our assessment of the present-day situation in the world. This situation is complex and tense, and I would even say explosive. Besides, it has a tendency to become still worse. I will not speak here about the causes of this process. You know very well our viewpoint on this matter. I would rather reply to the question of where we all are at present, in what world we are living. The least of my intentions is to dramatize the situation. But I intend to be frank with you because much depends on the assessment of the situation by both sides. We hold that when we deal with leaders of such powers as the United States and the USSR their analysis of the situation and their practical policy should be permeated with a sense of the tremendous responsibility that rests on them before their own peoples and the whole of mankind.

The reality of our time is that the level of development of science and technology makes the origination of a totally new situation, the commencement of a totally new stage of the arms race, possible. I tried frankly to reply to your questions and I ask you not to treat my replies as a new portion of "propaganda." For it is a fact that already now it is very difficult for the United States and the Soviet Union to come to terms, to take some steps toward each other. The mutual mistrust is so great. And if the arms race enters a new stage, if the latest achievements of science and technology are used in practice for these aims, will not one of the sides feel tempted to use the imagined superiority over the other side in order to get a free rein and make the fateful step? A very responsible stage.

But however acute our bilateral relations are, some limitations nevertheless continue to operate today: the existence of military-strategic parity that ensures for both sides a certain degree of security, the ABM treaty, the SALT II treaty that is being observed in practice, the nuclear nonproliferation treaty, and the treaty banning nuclear tests in three environments. These limitations do exist and exert their influence. But, as is known, attempts to undermine them are already being made: Forces have been brought into play that strive to remove these limitations that impede a further development of the arms race.

Were all these restraining factors to vanish, the competition in the development of ever-newer types of weapons would proceed with unprecedented force, because all the steps taken here by one side would be countered by steps taken by the other side. The appearance of a poison is followed by the appearance of an antidote. Such is a lesson of history that must not be ignored.

At what, then, will we arrive?

I would put it this way: Time is running out; the train might leave if we do not act fast enough. Such is the second motive of my consent to reply to the questions of TIME magazine.

All people want to live, nobody wants to die. So it is necessary to muster political courage and stop the developing sinister process. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to start disarmament and the improvement of relations.

I have already had the opportunity to say, during the conversation with the delegation of the United States Congress headed by Speaker O'Neill that visited Moscow, that we are emphatically for an improvement of Soviet-American relations. Such is the viewpoint of our leadership. We draw sober realistic conclusions from the current situation. It is an indisputable fact that we not only call for an improvement of the situation, for an improvement of relations but also make absolutely concrete proposals and also take on our part practical steps in that direction. It is only natural that in doing so we count on an appropriate response of the American side.

Alas, in response to all our attempts to escape the vicious circle of the arms race and mutual suspiciousness we hear only a negative answer: "No, no, no, propaganda, propaganda, propaganda." But that really is not the way serious politicians behave with their partners.

Nevertheless, we hold that all that we have heard from Washington about the latest steps of the Soviet Union, including our proposals designed to move from a standstill the talks on the nonmilitarization of space, on strategic nuclear arms and on medium-range arms, our decision to end nuclear explosions, etc, is not the final say of the American administration. We hope for this.

Esteemed gentlemen, I regard this part of our conversation, when we are talking here, looking each other in the eyes, as the most important one. We hope that the American public will be clearly and conscientiously informed of our understanding of the current situation in the world and in Soviet-American relations, our understanding of how one must act in this situation.

Our countries simply cannot afford to allow matters to reach a confrontation. Herein lies the genuine interest both of the Soviet and American peoples. And this must be expressed in the language of effective politics. It is necessary to stop the arms race, to tackle disarmament, put Soviet-American relations into a normal channel. Honestly, it is time to make these relations between the two great peoples worthy of their historic role. For the destiny of the world, the destiny of world civilization really depends on our relations. We are prepared to work in this direction.

The situation is acquiring special acuteness also because the political atmosphere in Washington, judging by the information that reaches us, is being fanned up more every day. Statements are being made that cannot but give rise to surprise and indignation.

The White House and some representatives of the U.S. Administration are intimating that any accords with the Soviet Union on the limitation of the arms race are out of the question. The most that one can hope for, they declare, is the mutual acquaintance of the leaders of the two countries and the drafting of an agenda for discussion in the coming years and even decades. For example, an interview by such representatives of the United States Administration as Armacost and Tower, published a couple of days ago, is couched in this spirit. In short, everything is being done to ward off in advance any possibility of accords between the United States and the USSR on ending the arms race and preventing the militarization of outer space. It is stated in Washington with utter frankness: Whatever the Soviet Union does, the United States under all circumstances will create strike space weapons and antisatellite systems. That's what I call nailing something. First they break off the nailheads and then want somebody to pull them out with his teeth.

What is to be done in such a situation? It is necessary to stop this process. That will be in the interests both of the Soviet Union and the United States.

Countless attempts that were made in the past to force the Soviet Union to its knees, to exhaust it; all that had failed and all such attempts will fail in the future as well.

As for us, we are not declaring the United States an "evil empire." We know what the United States is, what the American people are, and their role in the world. We stand for a new, better stage in our relations. But if matters reach a qualitatively new stage of the arms race, which I have referred to, it will be much more difficult to solve such a task, if possible at all. That is why we call on the United States seriously to reach agreement with us on strategic nuclear arms, on medium-range arms and on problems of outer space.

Well, it seems I have said what was most important. Now I would like to hand over to you the signed text of my replies to TIME magazine's questions so nobody can accuse you of printing anonymous replies. (laughter) I draw your attention to the green cover: There is not even a hint of any export of revolution. (laughter)

Henry Grunwald: Mr. General Secretary, we are extremely happy to be here to get this interview, and specifically for the reasons you have stated for choosing to convey these thoughts to the American public.

You have given us your time generously. We are concerned about U.S.-Soviet relations, very much so, but we are not alone in that concern. You have spoken just now about certain people in Washington who seem to you to be trying to undermine U.S.-Soviet relations, but President Reagan himself has said on a number of occasions that there is no hositility toward the Soviet Union, that he is seeking an improvement in relations with it and does not seek military superiority over your country. Do you accept these assurances? And more broadly, what are your impressions so far of President Reagan?

Mikhail Gorbachev: To a certain extent I have already mentioned this in the written replies. We took note of a number of the President's positive pronouncements in 1983 and 1984, including his speech in the United Nations. We took note of his remarks that nuclear war is impermissible, that there will be no victors in it. This is very important. We also paid attention to his words that the United States does not strive for attainment of military superiority over the USSR. This and other positive points in the President's remarks, as it appears to us, offer the possibility to peer into the future together, to overcome the present negative phase in our relations. We believe that it is still possible to set many things right by covering our parts of the road towards each other. That is why we consented to the meeting with the President in Geneva. For the same reason, we react so acutely to what is being said today in Washington in connection with that meeting. As an American woman journalist put it, it is intended to work up the American public to such a state that even if the accord reached in Geneva is only on an exchange of ballet companies, people will applaud.

We are in a serious mood and are preparing serious proposals for that meeting -- whatever is said by right-wingers and other personalities around President Reagan. We would not have agreed to the meeting if we did not have faith in the possibility of its positive outcome. Such is our psotion.

You have also asked about my personal opinion of the President. I have not met with him and it is difficult for me to express my opinion of him in human terms. But in political terms we proceed from the premise that the President was elected by the American people, which is respected by our people, and we are prepared to do business with him.

Henry Grunwald: I would like to ask a question concerning space weapons. In your written replies to our questions and in the conversation with us you said the Soviet Union wished to reach accords in three areas: strategic offensive arms, medium-range nuclear arms, and space arms. Yet, from the commentary that one reads coming from Moscow, there seems to be really no room for talks on the problem of space weapons because the only thing you want with regard to space weapons is to stop them, to stop all research. So I want to ask if the Soviet Union is prepared to conduct talks on space weapons? For it is known that you, too, have conducted and are conducting extensive research in this field and, therefore, evidently realize that it is impossible to stop this activity entirely on the strength of talks. One can only reach accord on some agreed-upon levels or limits.

Mikhail Gorbachev: A very fundamental question. If there is no ban on the militarization of outer space, if an arms race in space is not prevented, then there will be nothing at all. This is our firm position. And it is based on our most responsible appraisal that takes into account both our interests and those of the United States. We are prepared to conduct talks, but not on space weapons; not on what specific types of these weapons it will be allowed to deploy in outer space. We are prepared to conduct talks on preventing an arms race in outer space.

The Soviet Union proposed that agreement be reached in Geneva on the prohibition of the development, including research, testing and deployment of strike space weapons. It is necessary for a ban to embrace every phase of the inception of this new class of armaments. Research, indeed, is a part of the program to develop space weapons. So when we see that the United States appropriates tens of billions of dollars for this research, we absolutely clearly realize the real plans of the authors of those programs, and the eventual goal of the policy on the deployment of weapons in space that stems from those programs.

When we speak about research and the need to ban it, we naturally do not mean fundamental sciences. This research is going on and, obviously, will continue. What we speak about is development projects in the United States carried out under assignments and contracts from the Pentagon; moreover, about those which have reached a point when there are bound to appear models and experimental prototypes and when out-of-laboratory, field experiments, and tests are to be conducted -- in short, when everything necessary for the subsequent stage of designing and producing appropriate systems is being done. When the United States asks us if it is possible to verify compliance with an appropriate ban, we say it is. Verification with the help of national technical means is possible at the stage I have just described. If we now can discern car license plates from space, we will most certainly be able to monitor out-of-laboratory, field tests. The main point here is that if the process is stopped in the initial phase of the so-called research, any interest in the subsequent stages of the development of space weapons will evaporate. Who will then be willing to squander resources?

However, if tens of billions of dollars are spent on research, no one, naturally, would like to stop halfway. And when weapons are ultimately placed in space, the process will get out of hand altogether and we will reach, as I have already said, a situation the consequences of which will be impossible to predict.

And you can be certain that the other side will not be sitting on its hands.

Talk about a purely research character of the SDI is basically meant to conceal the extensive process of the development of space-based weapons systems.

The fact that the United States is now planning to test second-generation ASAT systems is fraught with serious consequences. We will have to react to this adequately. In fact, what it amounts to is the testing of certain components of space-based ABM systems. Moreover, we have to reckon with Washington's negative response to our proposal that the United States join our moratorium on nuclear explosions.

The U.S. Government also refuses to stop tests because it needs them to develop nuclear pumping for laser-based ABM systems. But these are components of a future space-based ABM system. And what if the program is put into top gear? Let America think seriously about the consequences of this.

Perhaps someone in the United States has decided that the possibility of overtaking us has put a hold on the Soviet Union. But this is an illusion. It was not achieved in the past, and it will not be achieved now. We shall find a response, and quite an adequate one at that. But then all the talks will be buried and I do not know when it will be possible to return to them. Perhaps, this prospect is to the liking of the U.S. military-industrial complex but we, anyway, are not going to play into its hands.

Our proposals are meeting the interests of both the Soviet people and the people of the United States. And this is precisely what riles representatives of the military-industrial complex most of all. And, one must say, there are many of them in the United States, quite a few in the government, too; and we feel that, of course. But I must say that we have a huge reserve of constructiveness. We will continue to urge the U.S. Government to take a different approach. Great opportunities would then be opened in the field of strategic nuclear arms and medium-range systems alike and the way would be clear for a serious process of improving relations between our countries and for resolving other international problems.

When I was in Dnepropetrovsk recently, a worker asked: What are these "star wars" plans made by President Reagan? Will the United States not deceive us? I replied: Do not worry, we will not let ourselves be deceived. But if our partners in the talks show readiness to look for mutually acceptable solutions, we will make every effort to reciprocate.

I think our position is humane and unselfish: It fully meets the interests of the Soviet Union, the United States, and all other peoples as well.

Don't you Americans have any better use for your money? We know that you have problems that must be solved. Perhaps, we do not know them as well as we do our own -- but we do know tham.

Ray Cave: I would like to ask two questions. I have sensed in your words concern over certain events related to U.S. statements and actions during the past few weeks. I have in mind, specifically, the announcement of the forthcoming ASAT tests and also the very strange case of chemicals with which Americans were supposedly dusted in Moscow. Apparently, these two events cannot be considered auspicious in the context of intensive preparations for the forthcoming Soviet-U.S. summit. Have these two events come as a surprise to you and have they seriously damaged summit preparations?

Mikhail Gorbachev: As for preparations for the Geneva summit, I can assure you that we are preparing seriously for it, attaching immense importance to that meeting, and pinning serious hopes on it. True, we do hear the pronouncements of our partners which show that Washington attaches a more modest importance to the summit and characterizes it as a mere "get acquainted" meeting and a possibility to draw up an agenda for some future, remote talks. But it is too great a luxury for the leaders of the two such states as the Soviet Union and the United States to go to Geneva merely to get acquainted and then admire Lake Geneva and the Swiss Alps. When the international situation is so tense, it would be an unpardonable luxury.

In short, we are seriously preparing for the meeting and will do everything possible for it to yield tangible results for the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States.

Ray Cave: In a magazine article to be released this weekend, former President Nixon says that an agreement limiting or reducing arms, but not linked to restraints on political conduct, would not contribute to peace. In effect, he is saying that the first priority of a summit should not be arms control, but potential flash points and pressure points between the United States and the Soviet Union. Do you share that view?

Mikhail Gorbachev: It was interesting to hear from you about Mr Nixon's viewpoint. As for specific issues we will discuss with President Reagan in Geneva, we are working on them in conjunction with the U.S. Department of State and the White House. This process is continuing and I would not like to go into details at this stage.

But I have associations of a different nature with Nixon's name. There was a time when, despite a complex situation, we managed to find possibilities and ways for developing cooperation with the U.S. Government under Nixon. Very important decisions were made at that time.

Recall the 1960's. The international situation was not relaxed at that time either. But it was in 1963 that a very important treaty banning nuclear tests in the three media, still effective today, was concluded.

All this belongs to history. But history is good when its lessons are not wasted. So now we must look at the situation from responsible positions of statesmanship and find ways to improve the situation and to put right Soviet-U.S. relations.

Henry Grunwald: I wonder if we could venture one or two personal questions. You have started quite a new style of politics in the Soviet Union. You have gone out and met many people, mingled with workers, and been very visible. Do you enjoy this kind of activity? What benefits do you see deriving from it?

Mikhail Gorbachev: First, it was V.I. Lenin who taught us this style. He spoke constantly about the need to live in the midst of the masses, to lend an ear to them, sense their sentiments and reflect their aspirations in practical policy. So the priority in this belongs to V.I. Lenin, and such personalities appear once in a century.

Second, this practice is not new to me. I behaved this way when I was working in the Stavropol territory, and here, in Moscow, before I was elected to my present post. Many people among us work in the same way. Perhaps, the press is now giving more publicity, is covering wider my trips and meetings with people.

On the whole, we have a need for precisely such a style of activity. We are faced with problems, and rather big ones, too. They should be solved in a new way. In the course of recent years we have been analyzing the present stage of our development, and there is a need to acquaint the working people with the conclusions at which we arrived, to check them out on the attitudes of people, and then submit them to the upcoming congress of our party.

So the point is not whether I like this style or not, but particularly that it is impossible to work in a different way now if we wish to achieve practical results in the policy we have worked out.

Henry Grunwald: A very frank question: You have proposed very deep changes in Soviet society and have already replaced quite a number of officials. One assumes you will replace quite a few more. Are people afraid of you?

Mikhail Gorbachev: I do not think so. What is being done in our country now has not been conceived by myself alone. This reflects the consensus of our entire leadership. We are convinced that our actions are right. These problems are ripe and must be solved. The main conclusion one arrives at as a result of talking with people is that our proposals and practical steps are ardently supported. Moreover, in the party and among the population, there is the desire to act at a still faster pace. We hold that while it is necessary to show courage and resolution, at the same time we must exercise caution. We shall continue acting in the spirit of high responsibility toward our people.

And people demand from us a firm policy, so that words should not differ from deeds. So we are strictly controlled in this sense. And the fact that we are not acting in an atmosphere of greater openness shows our democracy still more. So it is now a matter of people being afraid. Quite the contrary, they welcome our approach.

I do not want you to think, however, that I am trying to present everything in a rosy light. A profound process is taking place in the country. It requires much readjustment from all of us. Naturally, this affects people, personnel, and has a bearing on the work methods of everyone. So the change of some personnel does not mean that we have an extraordinary situation. This is a natural process and it is bad when this process stops.

So the matter is not that some or other personnel changes reflect some political struggle around the questions we are solving now. We believe that readjustment is required from everyone and everywhere -- from us, in the republics, in the regions, in every work collective. This will, naturally, require vast efforts from the party. However, because the line we took reflects the urgent needs, it is resolutely supported by our people. This gives us confidence that we are acting correctly.

In conclusion I would like to express an idea that can be regarded as cardinal to our entire conversation. It was said, justly, that the foreign policy is an extension of the home policy. Because this is so, I would ask you to give some thought to the following: Because we are making such challenging domestic plans, what external conditions must we be interested in? I leave it to you to furnish the answer.

Henry Grunwald warmly thanked Mikhail Gorbachev for the reception and the conversation.

PRAVDA NOTES WEINBERGER REMARKS ON USSR THREAT

PM031001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 1 Sep 85 First Edition p 5

["Minister Raving" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Caspar Weinberger, the U.S. defense secretary, has addressed a congress of the reactionary "American Legion" organization in the city of New Orleans.

His speech, as usual, abounded in slanderous fabrications and mendacious assertions about a mythical "comprehensive Soviet military threat." The secretary tried to scare his audience by alleging that "Soviet military expansion" threatens the United States, other states in the Western hemisphere, as well as Europe and Asia, and declared without grounds that the Soviet Union is supposedly interfering in the affairs of other countries. In this respect, the fantasies of this unbridled person simply knew no bounds.

At the same time, the Pentagon chief stated that the accelerated build-up of the U.S. military potential, which the Reagan administration is pursuing, is pretty well the determining factor that compels the USSR to negotiate with the United States at Geneva. He also said that Washington would never give up so-called "research" in the framework of the "star wars" program, emphasizing that the White House is using the notorious "Strategic Defense Initiative" as a lever for putting political pressure on the Soviet Union.

It is not the first time that the spokesman for the U.S. military-industrial complex in the American Administration has made slanderous statements and insinuations about the policies pursued by the USSR.

This emphasizes once again that there are forces in the upper echelon of power in the United States that will pay any price to hinder the normalization of Soviet-American relations and the limitation of the arms race. Casper Weinberger is first and foremost among their number.

ARBATOV LEADS DELEGATION TO U.S. FOR CONFERENCE

LD030522 Moscow TASS in English 0500 GMT 3 Sep 85

[Text] Washington, September 3 TASS -- A Soviet public delegation led by Academician Georgiy Arbatov, director of the Institute of U.S. and Canadian Studies of the USSR Academy of Sciences, arrived here today at the invitation of the institute of policy studies. The delegation will take part in the forthcoming fourth meeting of the public of the USSR and the USA on the problems of Soviet-American and international relations. The meeting which is to be held in San Francisco is timed for the 40th Anniversary of the founding of the United Nations Organization.

While in Washington, the Soviet delegation is to have meetings with members of Congress, and representatives of political, public and journalistic circles.

TASS CITES FORMER CIA OFFICIAL ON KAL INCIDENT

LD311434 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1023 GMT 31 Aug 85

[Text] Washington, 31 Aug (TASS) -- Aleksandr Lyutyy, TASS correspondent, reports:

It is possible to say with full confidence that, on the basis of the analysis of the available data, the reason the South Korean "Boeing" was sent into USSR airspace on 1 September 1983 was to triger Soviet air defense forces in this area and to collect intelligence information about them, Ralph McGhee, a former CIA member in Asia, said in an inteview with a TASS correspondent.

It has emerged, Ralph McGhee said, that the plane's pilot had deliberately sent wrong data about the altitude of his flight to Japanese air traffic control. Besides this, there is proof that after violating Soviet airspace, the plane was controlled manually and not automatically, as the American side has been claiming. This proves that the aircraft's commander knew well that the had crossed the Soviet frontier and that he knew the nature of his mission. According to the expert, the gross provocation against the Soviet Union was carried out directly by the U.S. National Security Agency and the CIA. The assurances of the Reagan administration that allegedly the "Boeing" had deviated from the course "by mistake," he said, do not hold water at all. Facts exposing the false statements of the White House about the "nonparticipation" of the United States in the provocation of the South Korean plane have been submitted by lawyers who defend the interests of the families of those passengers who died. Documents they have submitted to the Federal District Court in Washington contain data that, as the "Boeing" approached USSR territory, an argument started in the Anchorage air traffic control center over whether or not the pilot should be warned about it.

After listening to a tape recording of the conversations in the Anchorage center, a specialist who was invited to the court gave the following evidence under oath: "I heard the words, 'we must warn him.'" It is the view of the lawyers that the phrase was part of a conversation among air traffic controllers that took place at the radio microphone. It is noteworthy that the phrase was not included in the text of the conversation published by the U.S. Administration soon after the incident.

Lawyers for the dead also drew attention to the fact that, at that moment, the traffic controllers asked the pilot for the aircraft's position five times. They assert that staff at the Anchorage center knew about the South Korean aircraft's deviation from the normal route. Nevertheless, no steps were taken.

The material presented by the lawyers, says THE WASHINGTON POST, confirms that it was a spy plane and that it was sent specially to check the USSR's reaction to the invasion of its airspace. "The United States knows more about this flight than has been officially announced," stresses the newspaper.

AGRICULTURE SECRETARY BLOCK DEPARTS 1 SEP

PM021248 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 2 Sep 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under general heading "Official Announcements"]

[Text] U.S. Secretary of Agriculture J. Block has spent 2 days in Leningrad.

The visitor had a conversation at the oblast soviet. He expressed satisfaction with his stay in the Soviet Union. The secretary spoke highly of the recently signed protocol on cooperation in the sphere of agriculture. We are pleased, he said, that an exchange of specialists has started in accordance with the protocol, and consider that there are favorable prospects for this cooperation.

At the Piskarevskoye Memorial Cemetery the secretary honored the memory of Leningraders and servicemen who died during the Great Patriotic War and laid a wreath at the memorial's fraternal graves. Flowers were also laid at the monument to Leningrad's heroic defenders in Victory Square.

The guest visited the N.I. Vavilov All-Union Horticultural Scientific Research Institute and the Detskoselskiy Sovkhoz. He saw the art collections at the Hermitage and toured Pushkin.

J. Block departed from the Soviet Union 1 September. He was in our country at the invitation of the USSR Ministry of Agriculture.

BATMONH SPEAKS AT 29 AUG KREMLIN DINNER

PM301447 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 30 Aug 85 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report on speech by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Party [MPRP] Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium, at 29 August Kremlin dinner, under the general heading: "In a Friendly Atmosphere"]

[Text] Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich!

Dear Soviet friends!

Comrades!

First of all, allow me to sincerely thank the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Government, and you personally, dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, for the warm friendly welcome and the kind words addressed to our party and the Mongolian people.

We express profound satisfaction with the results of our friendly meeting. In an atmosphere of cordiality, full unanimity, and mutual trust, we have exchanged opinions on urgent questions of Mongolian-Soviet cooperation and international life. Today's talks have once again confirmed our mutual determination to continue in every possible way to broaden and deepen Mongolian-Soviet ties as a comprehensive package, steadily improve all forms of cooperation, and enhance its effectiveness.

I wish to point out with profound satisfaction that the time-tested unbreakable alliance and fraternal friendship between the MPRP and the CPSU and between the Mongolian and Soviet peoples, whose foundations were laid by the great Lenin and D. Suke-Bator, are stronger than ever and have an unshakable basis and bright prospects.

At the present stage, our fruitful cooperation is developing in breadth and depth in the political, ideological, economic, scientific, technical, and other spheres of public life, and direct business ties between party, state, economic, and public organizations are becoming stronger. With truly internationalist assistance and support from the Soviet Union the economy, science, culture, and health care are developing at an accelerated pace and the people's well-being is growing. In recent years joint enterprises, which have great prospects for further development, have occupied a growing place in our cooperation.

I take this opportunity to express to the CPSU Central Committee, the USSR Government, and the entire Soviet people profound gratitude for their sincere assistance and support on behalf of the MPRP Central Committee, the Mongolian Government, and the entire Mongolian people.

A new document of great political significance has been signed today, the Long-Term Program for the Development of Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation between Mongolia and the USSR for the period through the year 2000. It opens up broad prospects and defines specific directions for the further development of our countries' multifaceted cooperation. The successful realization of this program will lead to a new increase in our country's economic potential and the enhancement of the working people's material well-being. The next 5-year plan will be an important milestone on this path. We believe that this program fully accords with the spirit of the decisions of the CEMA countries' economic summit conference; will help to accelerate the development and enhance the efficiency of the Mongolian economy; and will serve to further broaden our country's participation in socialist economic integration.

Today the thoughts and ideas of our countries' peoples are directed toward greeting in suitable fashion the next MPRP and CPSU congresses.

We are following with lively interest the preparations of the Soviet Union's Communists and working people for the 27th CPSU Congress, which will undoubtedly be an outstanding event in the life of the world communist and workers movement. The CPSU Central Committee is taking vigorous measures to completely transfer the USSR economy to a path of intensive development and to sharply increase labor productivity on the basis of accelerating scientific and technical progress. The CPSU's bold, innovatory approach to problems of further improving developed socialism, as expressed in the decisions of recent CPSU Central Committee plenums and in the speeches of Comrade M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, also gives a new boost to our party's activity and inspires Mongolian working people.

To successfully complete this year and the 5-year plan as a whole, to create good groundwork for the first year of the new 5-year plan, to enhance labor productivity and the efficiency and quality of all work, to consolidate the positive changes in our life, to improve discipline, order, and organization -- these are the chief tasks on which the main attention of the party and all the country's working people is focused.

We fully share, dear Mikhail Sergeyevich, your appraisals regarding the present situation in the world, particularly in the Asian and Pacific region. It remains very tense. The chief source of this is the aggressive policy of the United States and its allies aimed at further escalating the arms race, achieving military superiority over the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries, and militarizing space. Imperialism's most aggressive circles are not abandoning their attempts to reverse the wheel of history and take social revenge on the forces of socialism, progress, and democracy.

Under these complex conditions, the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries are persistently pursuing a policy permeated with a sincere concern for the well-being and peaceful life of the present and future generations of mankind and resolutely advocate ending the arms race, preventing a nuclear catastrophe, and achieving disarmament. These aims are served by an extensive package of Soviet peace initiatives.

During the days when progressive mankind is preparing to mark the 40th anniversary of the rout of Japanese militarism, in which the USSR played the decisive role, the Soviet Union has advanced a new peace initiative. It proposed introducing a moratorium on all nuclear explosions as of 6 August. That is, on the tragic day when Hiroshima was subjected to an American atomic bombing raid 40 years ago. The USSR also calls for international cooperation in peaceful space exploration.

The Mongolian People's Republic approves and fully supports the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy course.

As an Asian socialist state, our country sincerely seeks to help ensure lasting peace and stability in Asia and to arrange good-neighborly relations among the countries of the continent and the adjacent regions. On this vast continent, where two-thirds of mankind lives, the forces of imperialism, militarism, and reaction are fueling tension, sowing discord and conflict, and increasing instability in its various regions. After Europe, the second nuclear missile bridgehead directed against the socialist countries is being created here. The peoples of Asia are seriously alarmed that there is a revival of militarism in Japan, whose military might and scientific and technical potential the United States is placing at the service of its own military-strategic interests.

Under these conditions, the proposal advanced by the Soviet Union with regard to a common, comprehensive approach to the problem of strengthening peace and security in Asia merits special attention. We believe that this proposal provides for a joint search for ways to ensure all-Asian security on the basis of pooling the efforts of all Asian states, large and small, taking into account the experience accumulated by Asian countries themselves and by states on other continents -- an example of which is provided by Bandung and Helsinki.

We are firmly convinced that the development of a broad dialogue among Asian states could promote the joint elaboration of the foundations of an international instrument for ensuring peace and security on this continent.

Mongolia comes out in support of good principles designed to promote the strengthening of peace and security in Asia, including the initiatives to create nuclear-free zones in one region or another and to settle disputed problems peacefully. We once again speak out in favor of the peace-loving initiatives and proposals of the three fraternal countries of Indochina, the DPRK, and the DRA.

Mongolia expresses solidarity with the just struggle of the peoples of Asia and other continents against neocolonialism and apartheid and against any imperialist interference.

Mongolia pursues a policy of normalizing interstate relations with the PRC on the basis of such universally recognized principles of peaceful coexistence as good-neighborliness, mutual respect for sovereignty, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. Proceeding from this position, which has repeatedly been clearly expounded, we are following with interest the progress of the consultations on the normalization of Sino-Soviet relations.

Closely coordinating its foreign policy course with the Soviet Union and the other socialist community countries, Mongolia is fully determined to continue making efforts to promote the cause of preserving and strengthening peace and the peoples' security and removing the threat of nuclear war.

Dear Mikhail Sergeyevich,

Dear friends and comrades,

Allow me, in conclusion, in all sincerity, to wish you and the fraternal Soviet people great new successes in realizing the large-scale tasks of further improving developed socialism and fittingly greeting the 27th CPSU Congress and in the struggle for peace and international security.

AFGHAN-PAKISTANI TALKS SESSION IN GENEVA ENDS

LD311346 Moscow TASS in English 1333 GMT 31 Aug 85

[Text] Geneva, August 31 TASS -- Another round of the Afghan-Pakistani talks on political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan conducted through Diego Cordovez, personal representative of the United Nations secretary general, has ended here.

The Afghan delegation at the talks was led by Foreign Minister of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan Shah Mohammad Dost. The Pakistani delegation was led by Pakistan's Foreign Minister Sahabzada Yakub Khan.

"The latest round of the Afghan-Pakistani talks in Geneva was useful and the delegations approached it seriously", Diego Cordovez said. "This gives the reason for believing that both sides are striving to achieve certain results to get out of the blind alley".

Diego Cordovez said the time has come to embark on the discussion of more important problems whose consideration will facilitate the making of concrete decisions necessary for the achievement of settlement and ensurance of its implementation. "Afghanistan and Pakistan asked the Soviet Union and the United States to be international guarantors in the ensurance of the implementation of possible agreements", he said.

Answering questions, Diego Cordovez said that at the latest round the Afghan side insisted that the talks be direct. But Pakistan does not want this. He announced that the holding of the next round of the Afghan-Pakistani talks is planned to be held in Geneva on December 16-20 1985.

'LARGE-SCALE' MILITARY OFFENSIVE IN DRA PROVINCE

LD021628 Paris Domestic Service in French 1100 GMT 2 Sep 85

[Excerpt] The Soviet and Afghan Armed Forces have launched a large-scale military operation around Kabul. At least this is what is being said at Islamabad in Pakistan, according to the eyewitness accounts of three Frenchmen who managed to cross into Afghanistan and return.

According to these witnesses, it is the biggest military operation launched by the Soviets and the Afghans since the occupation of the country at the end of 1979. The offensive began in Paktia Province near the Afghan border, and is now said to be moving north. It appears that the Afghan resistance members are defending themselves every inch of the way, but can do nothing against the power of the Soviet Army's aircraft and armored helicopters. Good day, Patrice Picart. You have just come back from Afghanistan where you were working for the weekly L'EVENEMENT DE JEUDI. This military operation does not surprise you?

[Picart] No, it does not surprise me, since I saw convoys from Kabul in Paktia Province. To begin with, it is really a counteroffensive, since it is a matter of retaking a provincial capital from the resistance members. It is a matter of a commander who is called Jalaluddin Haqqani, in the east of the country, who was about to take a provincial capital that was completely preventing the Soviets from using Khowst airport, since it was under constant fire from the resistance members. In order to stop this, the Soviets have in fact sent 20,000 men into Paktia Province against Jalaluddin's troops.

VOROTNIKOV-LED DELEGATION VISITS SRV ON ANNIVERSARY

Delegation Departs

PM021515 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 31 Aug 85 First Edition p 4

[Text] A Soviet party and state delegation led by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, left Moscow for Hanoi 29 August, at the invitation of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, the State Council, and the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The delegation will take part in the celebrations to mark the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of Vietnam's independence.

The delegation comprises Comrade Kalin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; Comrade Sitnikov, first secretary of the Irkutsk Obkom; and Comrade Chaplin, USSR ambassador to the SRV.

At the airport, the delegation was seen off by Comrade Chebrikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Committee for State Security; G. Pallayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium; G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and other officials.

Dinh Nho Liem, SRV ambassador to the USSR, was in the farewell party.

Arrival in Hanoi

LD300445 Moscow TASS in English 0433 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Hanoi, August 30 TASS -- A USSR party and government delegation led by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation has arrived here today at the invitation of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, the SRV Council of State and Government. The delegation will attend celebrations on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of Vietnam's independence.

At Hanoi airport the delegation was welcomed by member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee, deputy chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers Do Muoi, secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Le Quang Dao and other officials.

Reception by SRV Leadership

LD301416 Moscow TASS in English 1402 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Hanoi, August 30 TASS -- A Soviet party and state delegation led by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Vitaliy Vorotnikov was received here today by General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan, member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, Chairman of the State Council of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Truong Chinh and member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam, and Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Pham Van Dong.

On behalf of the Soviet leadership, Vitaliy Vorotnikov conveyed cordial greetings to the Vietnamese leaders and the entire people of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam upon the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of Vietnam's independence. It was stressed that the historic victory of the Vietnamese people had great importance for the international revolutionary movement.

The General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam pointed out that the August Revolution in Vietnam would have been impossible without the Great October Revolution, without the victory of the Soviet Union over German fascism and Japanese militarism. He expressed gratitude to the CPSU, the government of the USSR and the Soviet people for vast and effective assistance to Vietnam in the construction of socialist society.

Principled importance of the recent meetings and talks in Moscow between Mikhail Gorbachev and Le Duan for the further fruitful development and consolidation of fraternal friendship and cooperation between the two countries was stressed during the conversation which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere.

Key questions of Soviet-Vietnamese relations, prospects of their further widening and deepening, as well as problems of the present-day international situation were discussed. The Vietnamese side expressed complete support for the Soviet Union's latest initiatives aimed at the consolidation of peace and security of peoples.

Lenin Monument Ceremony

LD310851 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0600 GMT 31 Aug 85

[Text] A monument to Vladimir Ilich Lenin, the great leader of the world proletariat was unveiled at a ceremony in Hanoi today. It has been erected at the Chi Lang square in the center of the Vietnamese capital.

The ceremony was attended by Le Duan, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee; members of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee Politburo Truong Chinh, chairman of the SRV State Council; Pham Van Dong, chairman of the Council of Ministers; and other leading figures of the Communist Party and Government of Vietnam.

A USSR party and state delegation headed by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which has arrived in Vietnam to take part in the celebrations of the 40th anniversary of the declaration of Vietnam's independence, was also present at the unveiling of the memorial.

Kalin Speaks at Bridge Dedication

LD311818 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1630 GMT 31 Aug 85

[Text] Today the party-state delegation of the USSR headed by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, which is in Hanoi, took part in the handing over to Vietnam of the Thang Long bridge on the Red River, which has been built with the gratuitous help of the Soviet Union. A monument of Soviet-Vietnamese friendship was unveiled, symbolizing the unbreakable fraternity of the two peoples.

The head of the delegation warmly congratulated the Vietnamese and Soviet builders on their great labor victory. In the evening, a warm meeting took place between the Soviet guests and the activists of the Vietnam-Soviet Friendship Society, at which Kalin, member of the delegation and deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, made a speech.

Ho Chi Minh Museum Honored

LD011019 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0830 GMT 1 Sep 85

[TASS correspondents' report from Hanoi]

[Excerpts] In festively marking their national day the Vietnamese people have been honoring the memory of President Ho Chi Minh, their great son. The foundation stone for a Ho Chi Minh museum has been laid in Ba Dinh Square, where 40 years ago the leader of the Vietnamese revolution proclaimed Vietnam's independence and the formation of Southeast Asia's first state of workers and peasants.

Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee; Truong Chinh, member of the party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the State Council; Pham Van Dong, member of the party Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the Council of Ministers, and other leaders of the Vietnamese Communist Party and the Vietnamese state took part in the ceremony. A Soviet party and state delegation led by Comrade Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers, was also present.

The meeting was addressed by To Huu, member of the Vietnamese Communist Party Politburo and deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers.

The meeting was then addressed by Comrade Vorotnikov, who was warmly received by those present. The Soviet Union, he said, is well aware of, and remembers Ho Chi Minh as a loyal Leninist, and ardent patriot and internationalist. Ho Chi Minh devoted all his life and talent as a revolutionary for the struggle of a bright future for his people and for the triumphing of Marxism-Leninism. The creation of the party of communists, the militant vanguard of the working class and all the working people in the struggle to liberate the country and to build socialism on Vietnamese soil, was linked with his name.

The Soviet people and the peoples of the socialist community countries and the world communist and national-liberation movements sacredly honor the memory of the great son of the Vietnamese people. A monument to Ho Chi Minh is to be erected in Moscow in the square bearing his name. This event, like the unveiling of the monument to Vladimir Ilich Lenin, the leader of the world's proletariat, which has taken place in Hanoi, will be a new important landmark in fraternal relations between our parties and peoples.

There is no doubt of the fact that the Ho Chi Minh Museum, a tribute of esteem and love to an outstanding philosopher, revolutionary, and internationalist, will be a major ideological center for propagating Marxism-Leninism, the history and policy of the Vietnamese working people's successes in fulfilling the ideas of their leader.

Following the behests of Ho Chi Minh, the working people of Vietnam are consistently acting in favor of peace and friendship between peoples, while that same time maintaining their vigilance toward the forces of imperialism and hegemonism which are hampering the country's peaceful development, and are strengthening solidarity with the Soviet Union, Laos, Cambodia, and other fraternal countries.

At the present time the SRV is a reliable stronghold of the forces of peace and socialism in Southeast Asia. As previously, the working people of Vietnam have a devoted friend and reliable ally in the person of the Soviet people, who are led by their Leninist party. With every passing year, Comrade Vorotnikov stressed in conclusion, the fraternal friendship and unbreakable solidarity between our peoples are successfully developing and getting stronger. This was confirmed yet again during the recent official friendly visits to the Soviet Union by a Vietnamese Party and Government delegation headed by Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, and the latter's meeting with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. The visit made a big contribution to strengthening the ties of fraternal friendship and all-round fruitful cooperation between the CPSU and the Vietnamese Communist Party, and between the USSR and the SRV and is a new concerte step along the path of implementing the behests of Ho Chi Minh, the first herald of Vietnamese-Soviet friendship.

Visit to Xuan Mai Hydroproject

LD012044 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1415 GMT 1 Sep 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Excerpts] In Vietnam the festivities devoted to the national holiday, 40th anniversary of the proclamation of the republic's independence, continue.

The Soviet guests were given a warm reception by the collective of the Xuan Mai housebuilding combine built with the assistance of the USSR. Here the ceremonial commissioning of the enterprise took place, at which Comrade Vorotnikov spoke. He congratulated the builders on their major labor victory, the commissioning of the combine. "Soviet people," said the head of the delegation, "are proud of the successes of their Vietnamese brothers achieved under the leadership of the glorious Communist Party."

The Soviet delegation visited the construction site of Southeast Asia's biggest hydroproject, Hoa Binh, with some 2 million kw of power, which is built on the River Noire with the technical assistance of the USSR. The guests took part in the laying of the first cubic meter of concrete in the foundation of the structure of the dam. The delegation had a warm meeting with the international collective of builders of the hydroproject.

The Soviet guests looked around the exhibition of economic and technical achievements of the SRV, devoted to the 40th anniversary of the proclamation of the independence of Vietnam.

Army Troops Parade

LD021018 Moscow TASS in English 0728 GMT 2 Sep 85

[Text] Hanoi, September 2 TASS -- TASS special correspondents Ilya Maslennikov and Andrey Nizamutdinov report:

A parade of troops and a demonstration of the working people were held in Hanoi today on the occasion of the national holiday -- the 40th anniversary of proclamation of Vietnam's independence. The celebrations were held on the historical Ba Dinh Square where four decades ago leader of the Vietnamese revolution Ho Chi Minh made public the declaration of independence.

Present on the rostrum of the Ho Chi Minh Mausoleum were General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam Le Duan; members of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Vietnam; President of the Council of State of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam Truong Chinh and Chairman of the Council of Ministers Pham Van Dong, other leaders of the Communist Party and the state of Vietnam. Also present there was a party and state delegation led by member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation Vitaliy Vorotnkiov.

Le Duan addressed the participants in the parade and the demonstration with a speech. He stressed that the August Revolution had ushered in an era of freedom, independence and socialism in the history of Vietnam. Successes of the working people of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, said the Vietnamese leader, are inseparably linked with the great assistance and support on the part of the CPSU, the Soviet Government and the Soviet people. We shall continue strengthening the unbreakable friendship and all-round cooperation with the USSR. Units of all arms of the Vietnamese People's Army, columns of demonstrators marched on the square.

National Day Exhibition

OW030417 Moscow Television Service in Russian 2320 GMT 2 Sep 85

[From the morning "Novosti" newcast; A. Sturua video report, including interview with Tran Xuan Bach, secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam (CPV) Central Committee]

[Text] A national jubilee exhibition devoted to the 40th anniversary of Vietnam's proclamation of independence opened in Moscow 2 September.

[Sturua] Comrade Kapitonov, Comrade Tran Xuan Bach, secretary of the CPV Central Committee, and other officials took part in the opening ceremony. [video shows Kaptinov, Tran Xuan Bach at opening ceremony, exhibition pavilion] Fourteen Vietnamese state enterprises are presenting an interesting exhibition. Samples of traditional crafts are on display here: mother-of-pearl-encrusted lacquer ware and articles made from bamboo, rattan, palm trees, latania, and other tropical plants. There is a broad variety of consumer goods, whose production in the republic is steadily increasing. These include carpets and mats, textile and embroidered articles, sporting goods, footwear, and toys. Agricultural products, medical equipment, and medicines are also on display.

Speaking about the significance of the current exhibition, Comrade Tran Xuan Bach, secretary of the CPV Central Committee, said in an interview:

[Begin Tran Xuan Bach video recording in Vietnamese fading into Russian translation] This exhibition, like other public events we organize and conduct in the USSR, again testifies to our traditionally good relations with the Soviet Union. I am convinced that the jubilee exhibition in Moscow will serve to increase trade between our countries. The variety of our export goods will expand and the volume of deliveries to the USSR will increase. In turn, it will facilitate the further development of mutually beneficial trade and economic cooperation and the strengthening of fraternal friendship between the peoples of the Soviet Union and Vietnam. [end recording]

[Stura] The exhibition will last until 15 September, and soon one will be able to see many of the goods displayed here on the shelves of Soviet stores.

GORBACHEV MEETS FRENCH COMMUNIST PARTY LEADER

LD021145 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 2 Sep 85

[Text] A meeting was held today between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU, and Georges Marchais, secretary general of the French Communist Party (PCF). The conversation was held in an atmosphere of sincere friendship and comradely mutual understanding, and was characterized by a mutual desire to facilitate the further development of cooperation and solidarity between the two parties. The CPSU and PCF leaders exchanged information on the activity of their parties, and discussed key problems of the world situation, and adopted a joint declaration, which will be published later.

Taking part in the meeting were Gremetz, member of the Political Bureau and secretary of the Central Committee of the PCF, and Zagladin, member of the CPSU Central Committee, first deputy chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee.

Comrade Gorbachev also gave a luncheon in the Kremlin in honor of Georges Marchais. At the luncheon were Comrade Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Gremetz; and other comrades. The luncheon passed in an atmosphere of friendship and cordiality, characteristic of the relations bettween the CPSU and the PCF.

FRG'S WOERNER SDI SUPPORT REPROACHED

LD301639 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Moscow, August 30 TASS -- TASS military news analyst Vladimir Chernyshev writes:

West German Defence Minister Woerner is constantly preoccupied with the "star wars" programme, afraid to be late and hurrying to involve his country in the race in attack space weapons and further to "fortify" the Washington-Bonn militarist axis. The minister does not spare his time either: Going home from a vacation in Canada, he "dropped in" at the Pentagon to discuss "a more precise schedule" of consultations between the USA and West Germany at a governmental level on Bonn's participation in the implementation of the U.S. "star wars" program.

Way back in 1984, addressing a meeting of NATO's Nuclear Planning Group, Woerner said that the SDI program was leading to the destabilization of the strategic situation, contributing to the escalation of another round of the arms race, and also tended to create "zones of diminished security in NATO." However, he did not stick long to that position. Bonn's role of Washington's "general representative" in Western Europe made it impossible for him to have an independent opinion. Also, the defence minister promptly realized that West Germany's participation in the "star wars" program would equate it in "rights" with Britain and France, substantially diminishing the edge the latter have as European nuclear powers. Moreover, there seemed to be a possibility to reach the long desired but forbidden goal, that of involvement in the development of nuclear weapons.

Indeed, Bonn knows that, despite all the protestations of U.S. officials that the strategic Defence Initiative will make nuclear weapons "impotent and obsolete," Washington is developing third-generation nuclear weapons under the "star wars" program. Last but not least, the minister also has a "responsibility" to the West German military-industrial complex, avid for fat profits which it can slice off the multi-billion "star pie."

That is why the minister shed his scepticism over the SDI and wholeheartedly embraced a pro-American stand. Now he is in a hurry and grumbles that "the train has already started" while the West German Government is still thinking "whether it is on the right tracks." He openly stated at a U.S.-West German meeting in Dallas, USA, this year that West Germany supported the SDI research program. Woerner is fully in solidarity with Chancellor Kohl, who said in the Bundestag on April 18 that the U.S. research program was justified and politically necessary.

Necessary for whom? For the West Germans? No, for Washington, which is dreaming about military-strategic superiority and the development of a first nuclear strike potential, planning all sorts of "limited" nuclear wars and hoping for impunity. Opposition spokesmen have characterized this policy of the West German Federal Government as an outrageous evidence to kowtowing to the United States. Support for the "star wars" program, U.S. Senator Proximire pointed out, actually brought about the defeat of the ruling party in the local elections in Northern Rhine-Westphalia.

It should be added that participation in the "star Wars" program is contrary to West Germany's national interests, casts it in the role of Washington's "hostage" and supplier of scientific and technological know-how and financial resources to the United States, and makes the Federal Republic an accomplice of those who are planning to blow up the process of arms limitation and reduction and to plunge the world into a nuclear catastrophe.

Bonn's emissaries, who are compiling and concerting a "schedule" for the involvement of their country in Washington's "star" ventures, should have realized this long ago.

FINNISH ECONOMIC COOPERATION PROJECTS SURVEYED

LD301547 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1030 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] The construction of yet another gas pipeline, which will be 250 km long, is a big new Soviet-Finnish cooperation project. The pipeline will stretch from the Soviet frontier to the town of Tampere in Finland. Our correspondent Vladimir Savchenko reports:

The laying of pipes is now in progress. This is the second string of the gas pipeline. The first was commissioned in 1974. Soviet natural gas is widely used at industrial enterprises and it provides Finnish towns with heat. The new pipelines will also supply fuel to new combined heat and power stations, which will be built in Finland to a joint Soviet-Finnish design.

Here are examples of active cooperation in other fields: Metallurgy: The converter shop at the metallurgical works built at the Finnish town of Raahe with assistance from our country is being reconstructed this year, again with help form Soviet specialists. Shipbuilding: Together with Leningrad shipbulders the Finnish firm of Waertsilae is preparing for the construction of two new nuclear-powered icebreakers for the Soviet Union. "The Arctic Project" is the title of joint work on developing the resources of the Arctic shelf. The Finnish firm of Raumarepola has built the mighty Kolskaya drilling platform for our country. In the future such platforms will be built jointly with the Vyborg shipyard.

Twelve large Finnish banks and firms have offices in Moscow. One of them is Thomesko, which is a long-standing partner of Soviet organizations. I spoke to (Vera Reinikainen) head of the Thomesko departments responsible for special trading operations with the Soviet Union.

(Vera Reinikainen) said that Thomesko has had close ties with Soviet organizations since 1950 and is the general representative in Finland for the Soviet Eksportles Association. Every year, she continued, we receive up to 5 million cubic meters of timber from the USSR and we also buy Soviet (?cranes) and equipment of various kinds. Mutual trade with Soviet organizations is increasing year in, year out. She said great importance is attached to the development of cooperation with Soviet organizations. At the moment, for example, we are actively participating in work for the agro-industrial complex; we are now building a turnkey project for a vegetable store near Leningrad and we will carry out a similar project near Kiev next year. We will supply equipment to Tartu for a plant which will produce fruit and vegetable juice and we will fit out a new shop in Tallinn, she said. The firm Thomesko regularly carries out large Soviet orders for various types of equipment used in packaging food products.

(Vera Reinikainen) went on to say that Thomesko has developed very good relations with many Soviet foreign trade associations and with the USSR Chamber of Trade and Industry. Every year we take part in exhibitions in Soviet cities, and we hold many important meetings and talks in Moscow. All this enables us to look with confidence to the future and to make our contribution to the important cause of developing mutually advantageous economic cooperation between Finland and the Soviet Union, (Vera Reinikainen) stressed in conclusion.

FRG 'TRUTZIGE SACHSEN' MANEUVERS AGGRESSIVE

LD301834 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1134 GMT 30 Aug 85

[Text] Bonn, 30 Aug TASS -- TASS correspondent Sergey Sosnovskiy reports:

During the major Bundeswehr maneuvers "Trutzige Sachsen" [Defiant Saxony] starting on 12 September, the West German Army intends to rehearse "in conditions as close as possible to real combat" the movement of their units across the River Elbe in direct proximity to the GDR state border. These planned "onslaughts on the East" in the area of Helmstadt-Lauenburg are described by the democratic public of the FRG as further evidence of the growing aggressiveness of the Bundeswehr, which plays a key role in the structure of the NATO bloc in Europe. Similar "onslaughts" were recommended earlier this year by the revanchist rag SCHLESIER as one of the variants for solving the "German question," which allegedly remains open. This practically implies the "absorption" of the socialist German state. As can be seen, the Bundeswehr command has decided to heed the revanchists' "recommendations," in including in its program for a militaristic show such a provocative number as the forced crossing of the Elbe.

In the "Trutzige Sachsen" maneuvers, which are to be conducted on the territory of the Lower Saxony, more than 60,000 officers and men, 3,500 tanks, armored vehicles, and self-propelled guns will be deployed. Taking part in them, alongside the Bundeswehr, will be subdivisions of troops from the United States, Great Britain, Belgium and the Netherlands. Simultaneously, the NATO military will work out tactical operations in FRG airspace against "the enemy in the East" within the framework of the "Cold Fire" exercises.

A series of militaristic performances will be conducted on FRG territory within the framework of the "Traditional" autumn "Autumn Forge" maneuvers by the aggressive NATO bloc, which will deploy a total of 244,000 soldiers and officers.

SAUDI OFFICIAL ON TALKS WITH KORNIYENKO

LD020907 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0749 GMT 2 Sep 85

['Abd al-Wahhab al-Khashshan report]

[Text] Moscow, 2 Sep KUNA -- The chairman of the Supreme Council of Youth Welfare in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, Prince Faysal ibn Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, has described his Moscow talks with Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Georgiy Korniyenko as having been conducted in an atmosphere of friendship. The talks dealt with current issues and the situation in the Middle East.

In an interview with KUNA, Prince Faysal added that talks with Korniyenko, which took place at the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow and lasted for more than 2 hours, were very amiable. He conveyed to me greetings and best wishes from the Soviet leader, Mikhail Gorbachev, to the Saudi monarch, King Fahd ibn 'Abd al-'Aziz, and to the Saudi Government and people. In return, I conveyed greetings from King Fahd and from the Saudi Government and people to the Soviet Government, the Presidium, and the Soviet people. He added that talks with the Soviet official were centered on international issues and were conducted in a friendly atmosphere. They dealt with current issues, but did not concentrate on a specific issue. They dealt with the international situation, particularly the situation in the Middle East. He pointed out that the talks were very good. I believe, he said, that it is always beneficial for us to hear, and to acquaint ourselves with, the views of the big powers, and for them to listen to our points of view, despite the fact that the talks were unofficial as they were held at the Kuwaiti Embassy.

The Saudi official expressed his thanks to his highness the amir of Kuwait, the Kuwaiti Government, the Kuwaiti deputy prime minister, and Foreign Minister Shaykh Sabah al-Ahmad al-Jabir, and to the staff of the Kuwaiti Embassy in Moscow for their profound welcome. He said that the Kuwaiti Embassy is to us like an embassy of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. We found every care and welcome.

IZVESTIYA: SUPREME SOVIET MESSAGE TO KHAMENE'I

PM301059 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 30 Aug 85 Morning Edition p 1

[Text] To His Excellency Mr Seyyed 'Ali Khamene'i, president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

Please accept congratulations and good wishes on your reelection to the high post of president of the Islamic Republic of Iran.

We express the hope that relations between the Soviet Union and the Islamic Republic of Iran will develop in the spirit of good-neighborliness and in our peoples' interests.

The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium

CHILEAN SOCIALIST PARTY CONGRESS DESCRIBED

PY312225 Moscow Radio Magallanes in Spanish to Chile 0200 GMT 29 Aug 85

[Text] The Political Commission of the Chilean Socialist Party has announced that its clandestine 24th Congress, which convened after a 6-month process of hearing the opinions of its members inside and outside the country, has ended successfully. The congress re-elected Clodomiro Almeyda as secretary general. Talking to the press in Buenos Aires, Almeyda noted that the congress will contribute to the defeat and ouster of the military dictatorship by developing the mass movement, struggling for greater unity among anti-dictatorship forces, and creating conditions for an advanced democracy in Chile. The document of the Political Commission of the Chilean Socialist Party, which was simultaneously released in Santiago and Buenos Aires, notes that the congress considers that the struggle must be a constant and combative mobilization of the nation's majority, demanding bread, jobs, justice, and freedom, until the institutional chains of the dictatorship are broken through a national and popular uprising.

The socialist congress has been instrumental in increasing the unity among leftist forces and the role of the Popular Democratic Movement in the country. It called for a broad democratic agreement against the dictatorship. The congress also noted the importance of unity without exclusions and denounced commitments to the institutional order of the regime. The congress' conclusions also define the position of the Chilean Socialist Party as a class, revolutionary, autonomous, Latin American, and internationalist party aimed at consolidating the unity of the left.

The congress approved new party statutes and elected the new central committee. Manuel Almeyda was appointed secretary general in Chile, and Galo Gomez, undersecretary abroad. One of the congress' resolutions calls for support for the national protest scheduled for 4 September. Clodomiro Almeyda said the Chilean Socialist Party is in solidarity with the Chilean Communist Party and its mass action policy, supporting the utilization of methods that could contribute to the overthrow of the dictatorship.

CPSU'S VOROZHEYKIN LEAVES FOR URUGUAY CONGRESS

PM291422 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 29 Aug 85 First Edition p 4

[TASS report: "To the Socialist Party of Uruguay Congress"]

[Text] CPSU representative I.Ye. Vorozheykin, first deputy chief editor of PRAVDA, left Moscow for Montevideo 28 August to attend the 38th Socialist Party of Uruguay Congress.

MARSHAL SOKOLOV ISSUES ORDER OF DAY ON V-J DAY

LD022108 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 2 Sep 85

["Order of the Day of the Minister of Defense of the USSR" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, September 3 TASS -- "Today the Soviet people and its soldiers, the working people in socialist countries, all of progressive mankind observe the 40th anniversary of the victory over militarist Japan.

"Having routed the Kwantung Army, the Armed Forces of the USSR together with their allies forced Japanese militarists to agree to an unconditional capitulation. A big contribution toward this was made by units and formations of the Mongolian People's Revolutionary Army and the People's Liberation Army of China. Patriots in Vietnam, Korea and other countries of Asia staunchly fought against Japanese invaders," says the Order of the Day of the Minister of Defense of the USSR, Marshal of the Soviet Union Sergey Sokolov. The order is published in the press today.

"The rout of Japanese militarism which followed the crushing defeat of fascist Germany led to a further weakening of the forces of world imperialism, created felicitous conditions for the victory of national liberation and socialist revolutions in the countries of the Far East and South East Asia and promoted on upsurge in the democratic anti-war movement in Japan. Loyal to the ideals of proletarian internationalism, the Soviet Union rendered substantial assistance to the peoples of China and Korea in their struggle for social and national liberation," the Order of the Day stresses.

"Aware of its responsibility for the destinies of peace and taking account of the stern lessons of the past war, the Soviet Union upholds the sacred right of man to life and stands for friendly relations with all the peoples of the world, including the Japanese people.

"Overtly violating norms of international relations, the United States of America is working up tensions in different regions of the world, forges ahead with the arms race, unabashedly intervenes in the internal affairs of other countries. A serious threat to peace and security of the peoples of Asia and the states of the Pacific region comes from the revival of Japanese militarism, the military alliance of the United States and Japan, the process of formation on its basis of a Washington-Tokyo-Seoul military alliance and incessant interference of imperialist and hegemonist forces in the affairs of the countries of the region.

"In such conditions the Communist Party and the Soviet Government take all necessary measures to strengthen further the defense capabilities of our motherland, equip the Army and the Navy with modern weaponry and military equipment, and to consolidate the spirited alliance of the fraternal socialist countries," the Order says in conclusion.

SOKOLOV, ZIMYANIN ATTEND V-J DAY MEETING

LD021758 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 2 Sep 85

[Text] In the peoples' memory Victory Day, 9 May, is inseparable from another triumphant day in 1945, 2 September, when, following fascist Germany, militarist Japan signed the instrument of unconditional capitulation. It took only 4 months to advance from the routing of the spearhead forces of imperialism in the west to the victory over the mighty aggressor in the east. This was yet another outstanding victory for the Soviet Army; a great feat by our people for the sake of peace on earth.

The participants of a festive meeting held in Moscow today, which was devoted to the 40th anniversary of the Soviet Union's victory over Japanese militarism, spoke about the permanent significance of this victory. The meeting was attended by representatives of the capital's working people and by servicemen from the Moscow Garrison. In the presidium were Marshal of the Soviet Union Sokolov, candidate member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR minister of defense; Zimyanin, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and military chiefs, war veterans, participants in the fighting in the Far East, representatives of party, local government, and public organizations, front-rankers of production, scientists and cultural personalities.

AFP: PRESS REPORTS KULIKOV'S ACTIVITIES

AU030928 Paris AFP in English 0922 GMT 3 Sep 85

[Excerpt] Moscow, Sep 3 (AFP) -- Marshal Viktor Kulikov, commander in chief of Warsaw Pact forces, has been mentioned twice in the official Soviet press in the past week in an apparent attempt to squelch rumors that he had been replaced by Marshal Nikolay Ogarkov. The strong rumors in July of a return to favor of Marshal Ogarkov, the former chief of Armed Forces staff who was dismissed last September, were picked up by several Western news organizations. The rumors came at a time of reorganization of the military that included the removals of the chief political commissar, General Aleksey Yepishev; the commander of Soviet Forces in East Germany, General Mikhail Zaytsev; and the head of the Navy's Northern Fleet, Admiral Arkadiy Mikhaylovskiy.

Yesterday, an article was published in the government daily IZVESTIA over Marshal Kulikov's signature, on the "40th anniversary of the crushing of militaristic Japan". In an edition delivered in Moscow today, an Armenian newspaper, KOMUNIST, reported that Marshal Kulikov, 64, had paid a visit late last month to his voting district. The edition was dated August 31. Diplomats said that neither press account covered activities Marshal Kulikov would necessarily have undertaken in the normal course of his duties, and that they thus appeared aimed at showing he was still in the saddle.

Marshal Kulikov, one of three first deputy defense ministers, had not been seen in public since June 20. As for Marshal Ogarkov, there are reports -- which cannot be confirmed -- that he is commander of one of the four operational "theaters" of the Soviet Army. According to another version that has come to the ears of high-ranking Western diplomats, Marshal Ogarkov is involved in planning for a reorganization of the Defense Ministry.

After the reshuffling of top military posts in July, one theater command is known to be vacant. That is the Southern theater, whose commander, General Yuriy Maksimov, was named deputy defense minister in charge of strategic nuclear forces.